This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UNIVERSAL HISTORY,

FROM THE

CREATION OF THE WORLD

TO THE

BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

BY THE LATE

HON. ALEXANDER FRASER TYTLER,

LORD WOODHOUSELEE,

SENATOR OF THE COLLEGE OF JUSTICE, AND LORD COMMISSIONER OF JUSTICIARY IN SCOTLAND; AND FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF CIVIL HISTORY, AND GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES, IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

SIX VOLUMES.

VOLUME THE FIFTH.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET;

SOLD BY THOMAS TEGG AND SON, CHEAPSIDE.

MDCCCXXXV.

N. Y. PUBLIC CIRCULATING LIBRARY
BLOOMINGDALE BRANCH
8 AMSTERDAM AVE.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1916 L

LONDON:
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

CONTENTS.

BOOK THE SIXTH.

CHAPTER X.

Effects of the Crusades—Rise of Chivalry and Romance.—Page 1.

CHAPTER XI.

State of the EUROPEAN KINGDOMS towards the end of the Crusades, and in the Age immediately following:—Constantinople recovered by the Greek Emperors—Sicilian Vespers—Crusade against the Albigenses—Rise of the House of Austria—Spirit of the Popedom—Persecution of the Knights Templars—Rise of the Helvetic Republics—Council of Constance.—Page 17.

CHAPTER XII.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries—Deputies from Burghs first called to Parliament—Edward I.—Conquest of Wales—Scotland—Obscurity of its early History—Malcolm Canmore—David I.—Alexander III.—Bruce and Baliol Competitors for the Crown—Designs of Edward against Scotland—Sir William Wallace—Battles of Falkirk and Stirling—Death of Wallace—Robert Bruce—Edward II.—Battle of Bannockburn—

Edward III.—Battle of Halidown Hill—Invasion of France —the Black Prince—Battle of Cressy—of Durham—of Poictiers—Richard II.—Henry IV.—Page 39.

CHAPTER XIII.

England and France in the Fifteenth Century:—England under Henry V.—France under Charles VI.—Battle of Agincourt—Henry V. acquires the Crown of France—Charles VII.—Maid of Orleans—France recovered from the English—The Eastern Empire invaded by the Turks—By the Tartars under Tamerlane—Scanderbeg—Turks under Mahomet the Great take Constantinople—Greek Empire extinguished—Constitution of Turkey—France about the end of the Fifteenth Century—Lewis II.—Charles VIII.—Italy.—Page 74.

CHAPTER XIV.

Spain, France, Italy, and Britain, at the end of the Fifteenth and beginning of the Sixteenth Century.—Ferdinand and Isabella.—Extinction of the Moors in Spain—Lewis XII. of France invades Italy—Pope Alexander VI.—Julius II.—England—Henry VI.—Civil Wars of York and Lancaster —Margaret of Anjou—Edward IV.—Richard III.—Henry VII.—Union of York and Lancaster—Impostures of Simnel and Warbeck.—Page 102.

CHAPTER XV.

Scotland from the middle of the Fourteenth Century to the end of the Reign of James V.—David II.—Robert II., first of the House of Stuart—Robert III.—James I., II.,

III., and IV.—Marriage of James IV. with Margaret, Daughter of Henry VII., founds the hereditary Title of the House of Stuart to the Throne of England—Battle of Flodden—James V.—Ancient Constitution of the Scottish Government.—Page 127.

CHAPTER XVI.

View of the Progress of Literature and Science in Europe.—Page 153.

CHAPTER XVII.

View of the Progress of Commerce in Europe before the Portuguese Discoveries.—Page 175.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Discoveries of the PORTUGUESE in the Fifteenth Century, and their effect on the Commerce of Europe—Madeira discovered—Pope's Bull, granting to the Portuguese the Countries explored by them—They double the Cape of Good Hope—De Gama reaches India—Goa taken—Their Objects traversed by the Venetians—Portuguese sail to China—Establish Macao—Effects on European Commerce—Rise of Antwerp and Amsterdam—Progress of Commerce and Manufactures in England.—Page 196.

CHAPTER XIX.

Charles V. succeeds to the Throne of Spain—Elected Emperor of Germany—Contests with Francis I.—Alliance with Henry VIII.—The Constable of Bourbon takes Francis I.

Prisoner—Treaty of Madrid—Henry VIII. takes part with Francis—Charles defeats the Turks in Hungary—Defeats Barbarossa in Africa—Francis allies himself with the Turks —War carried on in Italy and France—Death of Francis I.—Rise and History of the Order of Jesuits—Ferdinand of Saxony Head of the Protestant League—Resignation of Charles V.—The Constitution of the German Empire.—Page 217.

CHAPTER XX.

Of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, and the Revolution in Denmark and Sweden—Reformation in England under Henry VIII. and his Successors—Immediate causes—Sale of Indulgences—Luther attacks the Abuses of the Romish Church—Zuinglius—Reformed Religion acknowledged by Decrees of the Senate in Zürich, Berne, and Basle—the Revolution in Denmark and Sweden—Gustavus Vasa—Anabaptists—Origin of the Name of Protestant—Calvin—Origin of the Reformation in England—Henry declares himself Head of the Church—Persecution under Mary—firmly established under Elizabeth.—Page 244.

CHAPTER XXI.

Discovery of America.—Columbus discovers Cuba—The Caribbees—America—Description of Inhabitants and Productions—Cruelties of the Spaniards—Conquest of Mexico —Discovery of Peru—Administration of the Spaniards—Possessions of other European Nations in America.—Page 271.

CHAPTER XXII.

Age of Leo X.—State of the Arts under the Goths—Revival in Italy—Cimabue—Academy for Painting instituted at Florence, 1350—Michel Angelo, Raffaelle, and Leonardo da Vinci—The different Italian Schools—Flemish School—Dutch Statuary and Architecture—Art of Engraving.—Page 297.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Survey of the State of the principal Kingdoms of Asia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries:—Selim reduces Egypt—Solyman takes Rhodes—Subdues Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachia—Selim II. takes Cyprus—Battle of Lepanto—Persians under Shah Abbas—Government and Religion—Tartars—India, early Particulars of—Aurengzebe—Bramins—Divisions of Castes.—Page 320.

UNIVERSAL HISTORY.

BOOK THE SIXTH.

CHAPTER X.

Effects of the Crusades—Rise of Chivalry and Romance.

SEVERAL authors have incidentally touched upon the effects produced by the crusades on the government and manners of the European nations; particularly two of the greatest of our English historians, Hume and Robertson, the last of whom has examined that topic, at considerable length, in the introduction to the History of Charles V. The subject, however, is not, as I apprehend, exhausted. The particular effects which have been touched on by these authors, I shall very briefly recapitulate. Some of them are, as I think, liable to a few objections, and I shall subjoin the notice of such other consequences as I think must have been the natural and certain result of those expeditions.

One immediate consequence of the Crusades is generally supposed to have been a refinement of the European manners, and an improvement of the arts imported by the crusaders, from an acquaintance with the countries more polished than their own; yet, the truth is, that we do not find

from history, that the period of the crusades was the era of any such actual improvement, either in manners or in the arts. The times immediately succeeding the crusades were, in many respects, rather inferior to those which preceded, than superior. The last crusade was finished in the year 1250: from that time, for above two centuries, there never was a period in which Europe, on the whole, appeared more barbarous and unenlightened; nor was it till after the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and the utter destruction of the Greek empire, which was in the year 1453, that there was any sensible improvement in the state of the fine arts in Europe. It was then that the Greek artisans, and many men eminent for their learning, being driven from their country, now occupied by the Turks, resorted to the different kingdoms of Europe, particularly Italy and France; and from that time, we may date with certainty the revival of the arts, and the sensible improvement of the European manners.

One certain effect of the crusades must have been great changes in territorial property throughout the kingdoms of Europe. The nobility and barons who went on those expeditions were obliged to sell their lands to defray their charges. The lands passed into the hands of other proprietors, and their former masters, such of them as ever returned to their country, had expended the whole of their fortunes. This fluctuation of property diminished the weight and influence of the greater barons, and weakened the aristocratical spirit of the feudal system. The lands of a single lord were likewise divided among a number of smaller proprietors;

for few individuals were then opulent enough to have purchased entire lordships. This would necessarily diffuse a spirit of independence, and bring men nearer to an equality of property.

In the next place, the towns or boroughs, which were then tied down by a sort of vassalage and clientship to the nobles, began now to purchase their immunity; and, instead of being entirely governed by these nobles, to whom the magistrates were no more than servants and stewards, while they exercised themselves the supreme civil and criminal authority, and imposed what taxes or exactions they thought fit, the towns now acquired a right of choosing their own magistrates, who were responsible to the public; they freed themselves from those arbitrary impositions, and were governed by their own municipal statutes, subordinate to the public laws of the kingdom. Thus the municipal government began, in many of the towns of Europe, to take the place of the feudal.

It is difficult to say whether the church, upon the whole, gained or lost by the crusades. The authority of the popes was certainly increased in the article of an extent of jurisdiction, and their right of conferring kingdoms began now to be less questioned, because it was so customary; but the unsuccessful issue of these enterprises, and their ruinous consequences in depopulating and impoverishing all Christendom, took a strong hold of the minds of men of sense, and thus weakened the papal authority, by exposing the interested and selfish motives which had influenced the see of Rome in preaching up those destructive armaments and expeditions. In another

respect, the gain of the church was balanced by its loss. Many of the religious orders and societies acquired considerable territorial opulence by the purchase of the lands of the barons at an easy rate; but this increase of wealth was proportionally diminished by the tax of the tenth penny, which it became customary for the pope to grant to the kings out of the revenue of all the clergy in their dominions.

A very sensible effect of the crusades over the greatest part of Europe was the necessity which the princes of the several countries found themselves to be under, from the scarcity of money, of making an alteration in the coin, and debasing its weight and intrinsic value. This occasioned excessive murmurings among the people, and their resentment was expressed by plundering the Jews, who were at this time the bankers over all Europe, and who it was thought, by amassing prodigious wealth by usury, had robbed and impoverished the different kingdoms in which they resided. Both in England and in France the Jews were the victims of this false idea, and they were not only stripped of their wealth, but banished from the country.

A few of the maritime cities of Italy were, perhaps, the most substantial gainers by the crusades. Genoa and Pisa enriched themselves in the beginning, by possessing exclusively the trade of furnishing ships to transport the forces to the Levant, and of supplying them, when there, with provisions. Venice came in afterwards for a share of those gains, and showed a more extensive spirit of enterprise, by furnishing troops, and

stipulating for a share of the conquered lands. By these means the Venetians acquired the province of Dalmatia, the Peloponnesus, the island of Candia, and several towns on the coast of Asia Minor.

The last particular which I shall mention as a consequence of the holy wars was, the perfection of chivalry, and of that romantic spirit for adventure which for some centuries infected all Europe. The real perils which those adventurers encountered were embellished in their narrations, and thence arose a fondness for extravagant stories, and wonderful fictions of the imagination.

On the origin of chivalry, a great deal has been written and conjectured, and many opinions been given, which, though they differ in some particulars, resolve untimately into the same idea, which is that this extraordinary institution, or rather system of manners, arose naturally from the state and condition of society in those ages when it was observed to prevail. The government of the Germanic nations where a vast number of detached tribes were each under the command of an independent chief, and the condition of individuals whose almost constant occupation was war, were a necessary cause of that exclusive regard which was paid to the profession of arms, in comparison with which every other employment was esteemed mean and unimportant. It was customary in many nations, that the first introduction of youth to the occupations of manhood was attended with peculiar ceremonies and distinguished solemnity: and thus, among the German nations, it was extremely natural that

the youth should be introduced with particular ceremonies to that military profession in which he was to be engaged for life. The chief of the tribe, under whose banner all his vassals were to fight, bestowed, himself, the sword and armour upon the young soldier, as a mark that, being conferred by him, they were to be used at his command, and for his service alone. When the feudal system became matured, and the vassals themselves had a subordinate train of vassals and dependents, they, in imitation of the chief or overlord, assumed to themselves the power of conferring arms upon their sub-vassals. There is a natural fondness for ceremonies which impress the imagination, and it is probable that, from a few solemnities first used, new solemnities being added from time to time, that extraordinary, complicated, and mysterious pomp at length arose, with which we find the honour of knighthood was conferred about the period of the eleventh century.

The candidate for that honour was previously prepared for it by the most austere fasts. He was obliged to spend a whole night in a church in prayer, to make a solemn and full confession of his sins, to receive the holy eucharist, and to have his body purified by bathing; then he was again introduced into the church, were he presented to the priest a sword, who, giving it his benediction, hung it round the neck of the novice; he again taking it off, presented it to the knight, or chief, who was to confer the honour upon him; and falling down on his knees, and joining his hands, after solemnly swearing to maintain the cause of

religion and chivalry, he received from him the spurs, the halberd, the coat of mail, and the sword. Then the chief, embracing him round the neck, and gently striking him three times with the flat part of his sword upon the shoulder, finished the ceremony by pronouncing these words—"In the name of God, St. Michael, and St. George, I make thee a knight. Be valiant, hardy, and loyal."

The young knight was now entirely possessed with a strong ambition of signalising himself by some romantic and dangerous adventure. He went forth, if we are to believe literally the chroniclers of those ages, with the determined purpose of provoking to combat some other knight of established renown; and to this effect a pretence was never wanting. He had only to assert boldly that the lady whom it was his happiness to serve and obey, excelled every other female in beauty and in virtue as much as the moon surpassed the stars in splendour, and to insist upon every knight he met making the same acknowledgment.

The high esteem of the female sex we have before remarked to have been characteristic of the Gothic manners. It was remarked by Tacitus, and by Cæsar, of the ancient Germans, and, in the progress of manners from the rudeness of their tribes at the time of these historians to the age of the perfection of the feudal system, it produced at length the high and refined ideas of romantic gallantry. The castles of the barons were in miniature the courts of sovereigns. The constant society of the ladies, who found only in such fortresses a proper security and protection, necessarily encouraged a soft intercourse, which the

authority of the baron kept always within the bounds of politeness. The protection of the honour and chastity of the ladies from all insult and outrage became naturally one of the characteristics of an accomplished knight; and the passion of love under these circumstances was necessarily carried to a most romantic height.

Spenser, whose beautiful fictions convey an idea of the true spirit of chivalry, strongly marks this connexion of romantic love with the profession of arms:—

"It hath been through all ages ever seen
That with the praise of arms and chivalry
The prize of beauty still hath joined been,
And that for reason's special privity;
For either doth on other much rely;
For he me seems most fit the fair to serve
That can her best defend from villany,
And she most fit his service doth deserve
That fairest is, and from her faith will never swerve."

To the passion for military glory and romantic love, which distinguished the profession of chivalry, were added very high ideas both of morality and religion: such morality, indeed, and such religion, as we may expect from the rudeness and barbarism of the times. The Gothic knights had the highest pride in redressing wrongs and grievances; but in this honourable employment the wrongs they committed were often greater than those they redressed; and in the vindication of the fame or honour of a mistress, a real and most atrocious injury was frequently committed in revenge of one purely ideal. Their religion, too, was of that extraordinary cast, that, though *professedly* superior to all other duties, it always in

reality acted a part subordinate to military fame and the honour of the ladies. It is confessed by one of their greatest encomiasts, M. de St. Palaye, that their devotion consisted chiefly in the observance of some external ceremonies, and that the greatest offences might be easily expiated by a penance or a pilgrimage, which furnished an agreeable opportunity for new adventures.

Chivalry, whether it began with the Moors or Normans, did not attain its perfection till the period of the crusades, when a great and interesting object was furnished to those who aspired at military fame. The spirit of adventure and the passion for glory had now a noble field for exertion; and we have observed accordingly that the most enthusiastic ardour seemed to pervade at once all the European nations. We have already seen how prodigious was the waste of blood in those expeditions, and how few returned to their countries of those immense swarms which poured into the East. But those few who did return found in the admiration and applause of their countrymen a high reward for their labours: their praises were sung by bards and minstrels, and their exploits recorded in a species of composition unknown till this time, the celebrated old Romances. This species of composition was so named from the *Romance* language in which the first of these works was composed. Latin was the vulgar tongue in France till the begining of the ninth century; then arose a mixed dialect between the Latin and the Frank tongues, which was termed *Romance*, and which in process of time is now matured into the French language.

Although the most ancient of those compositions, termed romances, treat of the actions of the heroes of chivalry, who existed even some centuries before the period of the crusades, it is very certain that, till the twelfth century, there were none of those works known in Europe. The first works of romantic fiction, which have laid the foundation of all the subsequent romances, were the history of the deeds of the Welsh princes, particularly Arthur, king of the Britons, written or compiled by Geoffrey of Monmouth, who died in the year 1154; and the fabulous exploits of Charlemagne and his twelve peers, written, as is supposed, by a monk, under the fictitious name of Archbishop Turpin, about the same period. At this very time all Europe was engrossed with the second crusade. Godfrey of Bouillon had taken Jerusalem, and the Holy Land was recovered. The attention of the European kingdoms was occupied entirely by those interesting relations which adventurers were daily bringing from the east, of wonderful exploits and extraordinary successes or misfortunes. But the appetite for the marvellous, which was then highly fostered by the ignorance and credulity of the times, was not sufficiently gratified by those relations, exaggerated as we may suppose them to have been. Something more was still required, and the romancer, who, in the relation of contemporary events, found himself too much fettered by known truths, was enabled, by choosing an ancient hero for his theme, to give free scope to his imagination, which, the more wonderful were its chimeras, gave still the higher delight and satisfaction.

Eginhart, the contemporary of Charlemagne, and his secretary and biographer, however credulous was the age in which he lived, and however fond of the marvellous, was not at liberty to embellish his narration with colours known by all to be beyond the truth; but the nominal Turpin, in his history of Charlemagne and his twelve peers, who introduced him to view through the medium of three dark centuries, was under no such restraint. Charlemagne is here a very different personage, and the dangers he really underwent in his extensive conquests are nothing to the dreadful perils he and his twelve peers are made to encounter amidst the horrible assaults of dragons and serpents, and the dreadful machinations of giants and enchanters.

The effect of these extraordinary fictions was in those days extremely powerful. That there is in the human mind a propensity to relish the description of those chimeras of the imagination has never been denied; and philosophers have endeavoured, by a variety of ingenious reasonings, to account for a fact, apparently so singular, as that the mind should take any interest in the description of events or scenes, while, at the same time, we are convinced, from our reason, that they are utterly impossible. The phenomenon may, perhaps, be thus simply accounted for. Every narration or description has, in a smaller degree, the effect of a dramatic representation. We allow ourselves to enter into the situation and feelings of the persons concerned. We adopt for the time their ideas and their character of mind; and as, in order to conceive and to be interested in the feelings of Hamlet, upon the sight of his father's ghost it is not

necessary that the spectator should have a belief in the reality of *ghosts* and *apparitions;* so in the fictions of Geoffrey and of Turpin, of Ariosto and of Tasso, when we see the characters act consistently with the belief of the power of enchantment, and the reality of spirits, giants, and fiery dragons, we adopt for the time their feelings, and are not at all disposed to quarrel with them on the score of absurdity.

But if at this day, under the disadvantage of giving no credit to the reality of these supernatural scenes and objects, we still find ourselves highly interested in such descriptions; how infinitely more powerful must have been their effect in those times when the unenlightened minds of the generality of mankind gave full belief to the power of magic, the agency of spirits, and all the train of "*Gorgons, spectres,* and *chimeras dire!*" That such was the credulity of the times when those romances were written is beyond all question—a credulity, too, which prevailed in times much nearer to the modern: and hence it is not a litle wonderful, that some, and those too ingenious critics, should have considered all those fictions as purely allegorical, and as being intended to shadow out real events, or circumstances of genuine manners, and as such attemped to explain them. Dr. Hurd, in his Letters on Chivalry and Romance, (page 28,) says, "We hear much of knights-errant encountering giants, and quelling savages in books of chivalry. These giants were oppressive feudal lords, and every lord was to be met with, like the giant, in his stronghold or castle. Their dependents, of a lower form, who imitated the violence of their superiors, and had not their

castles, but their lurking places, were the savages of romance. The greater lord was called the giant for his power, the less a savage for his brutality." It may be asked of Dr. Hurd, what then were the serpents and dragons? and Mons. Mallet, an ingenious Frenchman, will give the answer; for he explains them likewise by the help of allegory. "The serpents and dragons," says he, "which guarded the enchanted castles were nothing else than the winding walls which surrounded the Gothic fortresses, built on the projecting summits of rocks and precipices. It is pity there were no *cannon* known in those days, when romantic fiction was at its height, otherwise the allegory would have been complete, of the dragons *vomiting fire and voiding stench sulphureous.*" But this idea is altogether a false one: the more ancient romances were neither written with the purpose of conveying an allegorical meaning, nor was there any thought at that time of giving them such interpretation. They were readily received by the general belief in their literal signification; the power of enchantment was then fully credited, and if it is alleged that the authors of those works, who knew that they had spun them out of their own brain, must have been conscious that they were imposing a fiction on the world; I answer, that they believed, as firmly as their readers, that at least such events were possible; and in all probability adopted them from traditionary accounts, which they had done nothing more than arrange and embellish.

It will be easily perceived that I speak here only of the more ancient of the old romances. The mode of instruction by allegory came afterwards to

We may congratulate ourselves, no doubt, in the main, upon the victory of reason and good sense over superstitious prejudices; but a good taste with a lively imagination, still charmed with the perusal of those remains of *legendary lore*, will not easily console itself for the dissolution of that ideal world, or venerate the more that increasing philosophic light for having dried up for ever the sources of romantic fiction. As Voltaire himself exclaims:—

"Oh happy times of old, when sure assent
Was given to tales of airy sprites who guard
The household hearth, and earn their due reward
For labours to the careful housewife lent;
Or those kind fays by good Titania sent
To watch the just man's dream, and antedate
Elysium's bliss; such tales at evening fire
To all his list'ning race the hoary sire,
While mute attention reign'd, could well relate,
Or vengeance fell record of fiend's or demon's hate.

"But these are heard no more. The airy reign
Of Fancy fades away; and all the throng,
That fill'd creation's void, air, earth, and main,
Of forms ideal cease. To us belong
To trace with searching eye and doubtful ear
Stern Truth, and Science to her dark retreat,
To court coy Wisdom in her cloister'd seat,
And Reason's empire own and laws severe.
Error exchang'd for Truth, the gain how great!
Ah! Error had her charms—when lost, we own too late."

Such are the natural feelings of one who, though a philosopher, was also a poet. It will, however, require genius of a very remarkable order ever to revive among the polished nations of Europe a fervid taste for the romance of chivalry.

CHAPTER XI.

State of the EUROPEAN KINGDOMS towards the End of the Crusades, and in the Age immediately following:—Constantinople recovered by the Greek Emperors—Sicilian Vespers—Crusade against the Albigenses—Rise of the House of Austria—Spirit of the Popedom—Persecution of the Knights Templars—Rise of the Helvetic Republics—Council of Constance.

CONSTANTINOPLE taken, as we have seen, by the crusaders, did not remain long in the hands of its Western conquerors. The popes, however, for a while flattered themselves with the disposal of both empires. Peter de Courtenay was crowned at Rome, emperor of Constantinople, and his successor, Baldwin II., acknowledged the pope's superiority, by coming to Rome to solicit the assistance of a crusade, both against the Greeks and against the Mahometans. He solicited to no purpose, and returned to Constantinople only to see it fall into the possession of its ancient masters, the Greek emperors. Michael Paleologus, tutor to the young emperor Lascaris, retook the city; Baldwin fled; and Paleologus imprisoned and put out the eyes of his pupil, and so secured to himself the possession of the empire. He took care, however, to screen himself from vengeance by courting the favour of the pope, and once more reunited the Greeks to the Latin church.

Frederic II., surnamed Barbarossa, was at this time emperor of Germany, and paid homage to the pope for the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, which was possessed by his son Conrad. Conrad, it is said, was poisoned by his unnatural brother Manfred, who certainly seized on his kingdom, to the exclusion of his nephew the younger Conradin, whose right it was by inheritance. The holy see was always jealous of the dominion of the German emperors in Italy. Pope Clement IV., who hated the family of Frederic (the house of Swabia), and at the same time was desirous of punishing the usurpation of Manfred, gave the investiture of the kingdom of Naples and Sicily to Charles of Anjou, brother of Lewis IX. of France, on condition of his paying a large tribute, and renouncing his right after a limited period of time. Charles accepted the condition, and gave battle to Manfred, who was killed in the engagement, and thus Charles became master of Naples and Sicily, while young Conradin, with the aid of his kinsman the duke of Austria, prepared to vindicate his right to his father's kingdom. The pope armed in support of his vassal Charles of Anjou. An engagement ensued, in which Conradin and the duke of Austria were totally defeated—they were taken prisoners and condemned as rebels against the supreme authority of the holy church; Charles ordered them to suffer death upon a scaffold. Thus this prince secured his claim to the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, by a deed which filled his new subjects with horror. They submitted, for a while,

with silent indignation to his tyrannical government. The Sicilians at length, to whom the authority of this usurper became every day more intolerable, formed a conspiracy to vindicate their liberty, which terminated in one of the most dreadful massacres ever known in history. In the year 1282, upon Easter Sunday, *at the ringing of the bell for vespers*, it was resolved to put to death every Frenchman through the whole island of Sicily, and the resolution was punctually executed. Even women and infants underwent the general fate, and such was the savage fury of the Sicilians, that the priests assisted in the murder of their brethren, and cut the throats even of their female penitents. Thus the blood of Conradin was amply revenged, and the cruelty of Charles of Anjou signally punished—but these sanguinary proceedings brought new misfortunes on the kingdom of Sicily.

Peter, king of Aragon, who had married the daughter of Manfred, now stepped forth in support of the Sicilians, against Charles of Anjou, and claimed the crown himself in right of his wife. The Sicilians received him with open arms, and the consequence was a ruinous war of several years' duration, which involved this unhappy country in the greatest calamities.

We have mentioned the crusade against the Albigenses, which happened about forty years before this period. It is proper to give a short account of this detestable persecution. The Albigenses were the inhabitants of the Pays de Vaud in Piedmont, and principally of the city of

Alby. Some men among them had begun to reason about matters of religion; and in these times, when the abuses of the papal power were very glaring, it was not difficult to persuade the people to shake off a yoke which they found extremely burthensome. These people of Piedmont and Languedoc began to preach up the sacred scriptures as the only rule of conduct, and consequently the exclusion of all papal and ecclesiastical constitutions *. Innocent III. was the first who took measures to repress these dangerous heretics. He sent two Cistertian monks, with a commission to try them and excommunicate them, and required the assistance of the temporal lords of the country to deprive them of their estates, and to punish them with the utmost severity. This ecclesiastical commission was the first origin of the horrible tribunal of the Inquisition, which has since been the scourge of the catholic countries, and particularly of Spain, Portugal, and Italy. Their court was established at Toulouse, which gave such offence and disquiet to the count of Toulouse, that it is said he caused the first inquisitor to be assassinated. The opposition which he showed to the holy see cost him extremely dear. Pope Innocent discharged his subjects from their allegiance, and at length forgave him only on the condition of his giving up several of his castles, and promising to form a crusade himself against his countrymen. The

* Many of the Albigenses inclined to the Manichean heresy. See Mosheim, part ii. ch. 5.

count was compelled to obey, and under the command of Simon de Montfort, this holy campaign was begun. The city of Beziers, which harboured a great number of the heretics, was taken by storm, and all the inhabitants put to the sword; Carcassonne submitted, and implored for mercy, but the inhabitants were all driven out naked, and their goods confiscated. Massacres and public executions followed without number. Those unfortunate wretches died martyrs to their religious opinions, and numbers of them joined in hymns of triumph while they were burning at the stake. The unhappy count, compelled to be a spectator, and even an assistant in those scenes of misery, found means at length to escape, and betook himself to his brother the king of Aragon, whom he persuaded to arm in the cause of humanity. But that prince, whose forces when mustered in the field it is said amounted to 100,000, was, according to the incredible narrations of historians, defeated by Simon de Montfort with 1800 men. Simon, this atrocious and bloody villain, was killed soon after by a stroke of a stone, and from that period, the crusade, wanting a leader wicked enough to supply his place, began to decline. His son, young Montfort, was unable to keep the dominions of Languedoc which the pope had settled on his father. He renounced them to Lewis VIII. of France, whose death prevented his taking possession of them, and they were not annexed to the crown of France till the reign of Philip the Bold. The Inquisition, in the mean time, repressed all religious innovations, and the sect of the Albigenses, if it con-

tinued secretly to exist, created at least no more disturbance. The effects of this tribunal in quieting men's consciences were so apparent, that pope Innocent IV. established it over all Italy, except in the kingdom of Naples.

The rise and elevation of the illustrious house of Austria was attended with some remarkable circumstances, which strongly mark the spirit of the times. The first prince of the house of Austria who sat on the imperial throne was Rodolph, count of Hapsburg, who was descended from the counts of Tierstiern, a noble family of Switzerland. He possessed large patrimonial territories; and the honour he acquired by his military and political abilities induced some of the Swiss cantons to put themselves under his protection. Ottocarus, king of Bohemia, of whose dominions Austria then formed a part, appointed Rodolph his prime minister and steward of his household. On the death of the Emperor Henry II., the electors were so divided in their opinions whom to choose for his successor, that they agreed at length to commit the sole right of nomination to the Count Palatine, Lewis, duke of Bavaria. Lewis named for emperor Rodolph of Hapsburg. It may be conceived that it should be somewhat humiliating to the king of Bohemia, who was one of the proudest princes of his time, to find the master of his household elevated to the rank of his sovereign, and as such entitled to exact homage from his dominions of Bohemia. When this demand was made by the heralds of the new emperor, Ottocarus indignantly replied, "Go tell your master that I owe him nothing, for I

have paid him his wages." But this imprudent witticism cost him very dear. Rodolph instantly declared war against him, and in one campaign deprived him of Austria, Stiria, and Carniola. The emperor bestowed Austria on his eldest son, and it has ever since remained the patrimonial inheritance of his family. He now acquainted the king of Bohemia that his dignity as emperor positively required that he, the king, should perform homage as his vassal. Ottocarus was obliged to submit: but he required, as a condition, that the homage should be privately performed in the emperor's tent, and before the officers of the empire alone. On the day appointed, he repaired in his robes of state to the camp of the emperor, who chose on that occasion to be clothed in the plainest apparel. When Ottocarus was on his knees before Rodolph, the curtains of the tent were drawn up, and the king of Bohemia was exhibited in that attitude to the whole imperial army. This provoked the king to the highest pitch of indignation. He immediately renounced his allegiance, and declared war against the emperor, in hopes of recovering his dominions of Austria; but in his first battle he was defeated and slain.

Rodolph, like his predecessors of the Swabian line, aimed at the sovereignty of Italy: he wanted power, however, to accomplish this object of ambition, and he contented himself with obtaining sums of money from the principal towns, in token of their allegiance.

The Genoese, the Venetians, and the Pisans, were at this time contributing to the wealth, im-

provement, and civilisation of their country, while the rest of Europe (if we except England under Edward I.) was yet extremely barbarous. A dawning of liberty was, however, beginning to arise in France,—at least we may term it liberty when compared to the ancient servitude. The communities or corporations of cities which we have mentioned as a consequence of the crusades, began, under Philip the Fair of France, to be admitted among the states-general, and by degrees, acquired weight and importance in the nation. Till then, there had been but two orders in the state, the nobility and the clergy. Philip the Fair summoned the third estate to the general assemblies, and established a standing court of judicature, by the name of Parliament; and his successor, Philip the Long, excluded the clergy from assisting in those assemblies, in which, at their first institution, they presided. At this time, and long after, the parliament of Paris was nothing else than a supreme court of justice.

It were an object of some importance if we could ascertain what was the precise nature or constitution of the parliament of England at the period of which we now treat: but this is a subject involved in considerable doubt and obscurity.

It is certain that we may regard the Saxon Wittenagemot as the rude model of a parliament; but it is absurd to carry this notion so far as to find in that ancient assembly anything approaching to the present constitution of England in its three distinct branches of King, Lords, and Commons. We have no good reasons for believing that the commons had in those days a share in the govern-

ment of any of the European nations, nor till long after that age. If such ideas had existed before the feudal times, that system put an entire stop to them. According to the early feudal ideas, the commons were considered in a very abject and despicable light. Under the first princes of the Norman line, the supreme legislative power of England was lodged in the king and the great council, which was composed of the higher clergy and the barons. The prelates sat both as clergy by ancient usage in all the feudal kingdoms, and likewise by their right of baronage, as holding lands from the king, by the military tenure of furnishing men for his wars. The barons were the immediate vassals of the crown, and the most honourable members of the state. They owed their attendance in the court of their lord as a service, for which they held their possessions; and they were subjected to penalties in case of refusal. The crown had likewise other military vassals, the tenants *in capite*, by knight's service. These were likewise of a very honourable rank, though inferior in power and property to the barons. But though admitted to the general councils, they were not, it is probable, obliged to attendance by any penalty.

So far, there is no doubt as to the members of this general council. The only question is with regard to the commons, or the representatives of counties and boroughs; and this has been keenly agitated by the political parties even of modern times. It is surely enough that we enjoy a high measure of civil liberty at present: let us be grateful for it, and respect that consti-

tution which bestows it on us. Yet there are those who seem to think it an impeachment of their present liberty that their progenitors, eight hundred years ago, could not boast of the same freedom. But history must always shock violent prejudices; and the best informed historians have agreed that the commons were no part of the great council till a long period after the Conquest, and that the military tenants alone of the crown composed that supreme and legislative assembly. All the ancient English historians, when they mention the great council of the nation, call it an assembly of the baronage, nobility, or great men; and none of their expressions can, without the utmost violence, admit of a meaning which will favour the supposition of the commons making any part of that body. But the most certain proof of all arises from the Magna Charta, which enumerates the prelates and immediate tenants of the crown as entitled to a seat in the general council, without the smallest mention of any others; and we have already remarked, in mentioning the particulars contained in the Magna Charta, that most of the stipulations were calculated to enlarge and serve the privileges of the higher orders, with very little regard to the great body of the people. In those times, men were little solicitous to obtain a place in legislative assemblies, and rather regarded their attendance as a burthen than a privilege. Besides, by what rule was the people to be assembled? There was no idea of a delegated power in those days, or of the nature of representation: it was a notion too refined for

the age. The truth is,—and we shall be convinced of it upon reflection,—that high sentiments of liberty cannot arise in the minds of a barbarous people, but are the cultivated and fostered fruits of refinement and civilisation.

Besides this great council of the clergy and barons, the Anglo-Norman kings had their privy council, who were chosen by the king himself among his nobles, to assist him with their advice. It is asserted by Spelman as an undoubted truth, that during the reigns of the first Norman princes, every edict of the king, with the consent of his privy council, had the full force of law. But it is not probable that the barons were so passive as to entrust a power entirely arbitrary and despotic into the hands of the sovereign. All that we may conclude is, that the Constitution had not fixed any precise boundaries to the regal authority, and that the prince frequently asserted such powers of prerogative as might be in the main repugnant to strict right, and what his barons might have compelled him to observe. The arbitrary exertions of John are surely no rule for judging of what was then the constitution; for even the reformation by the Magna Charta can be less considered as the conferring of new rights on the barons, than the re-establishment and security of their ancient ones.

The spirit of the popedom, ever arrogant and extending its prerogatives, continued during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries much the same as we have seen it in the time preceding. Boniface VIII., elected Pope in the year 1294, was one of the most assuming prelates that ever

filled the pontifical chair; yet he found in Philip the Fair of France, a man determined to humble his pride and arrogance. Philip resolved to make the clergy of his kingdom bear their proportion in furnishing the public supplies, as well as the other orders of the state. The pope resented this as an extreme indignity offered to the Church, and issued his pontifical bull commanding all the bishops of France to repair immediately to Rome*. Philip ordered the bull to be thrown into the fire, and strictly prohibited any of his bishops from stirring out of the kingdom. He repaired, however, himself to Rome, and threw the pope into prison; but being soon after obliged to quit Italy, Boniface regained his liberty.

The conduct of Philip in another affair which happened soon after, is not so justifiable as his behaviour to the pope.

The Knights Templars, who had their rise in the holy wars, had acquired very great fortunes in those enterprises, and while they lived in splendour and in the most unlimited indulgence of their pleasures, their arrogance and their vices excited a general detestation of their order. The chief cause, however, of the resentment of Philip against this order of knights was probably their being concerned in a sedition, which arose on account of the debasement of the coin of the kingdom. The ostensible grounds of their accu-

* Boniface, in his bull, styling himself, "Dominus totius mundi, tam in temporalibus quam in spiritualibus," Philip thus answered him, "Sciat tua maxima fatuitas, nos in temporalibus alicui non subesse."

sation, and for which they were tried, were certain charges of impiety and idolatry, joined to some indecent practices in the admission of novices into their order. Clement V., who paid Philip implicit deference, issued his bulls to all the princes of Europe, to excite them to extirpate all the Knights Templars in their dominions, and they were complied with in Spain and in Sicily. They were rejected, indeed, by the English, who sent back the most ample testificate of the piety and good morals of this military order. The consequence, however, was, that in the continental kingdoms, these unfortunate men were put to the most cruel tortures, and finally committed to the flames. This abominable transaction has branded the memory of Philip the Fair with the character of a cruel and detestable tyrant, whatever may have been his wisdom, his spirit, and his political abilities.

Another remarkable event happened at this time, which does more honour to human nature, and is more agreeable to the pen of history to record. This was the revolution of Switzerland, and the rise of the Helvetic republic; the glorious and successful struggle for liberty and independence against tyranny and despotism. It has been mentioned, that Rodolph of Hapsburg, the founder of the house of Austria, possessed, by inheritance, some territories in Switzerland, and that several of the cantons had, from their high opinion of his military and political talents, placed themselves under his protection. The three cantons of Unterwald, Sweitz, and Uri, however, do not seem at any time to have ac-

knowledged a dependence on the house of Austria. Albert, the son and successor of Rodolph, was desirous of subjugating the whole cantons, and erecting them into a principality for one of his children. In this view, he endeavoured at first to persuade them to submit voluntarily to his dominion, but finding them tenacious of their liberties, he, with a very injudicious policy, attempted to force them to submission by sending among them viceroys, who exercised every species of the most insolent and tyrannical oppression. They were plundered, taxed, fined, imprisoned, and even put to death without form of law; and in a word, they groaned under all the miseries flowing from despotic power and barbarity. In this miserable situation they had no prospect of relief but in their own courage, and they began secretly to concert measures for delivering them from the tyranny of the Austrian government. Three country gentleman, whose names were Stauffach, Furst, and Meletald, are said to have been the chiefs of the conspiracy, and to have brought the three cantons of Sweitz, Uri, and Unterwald, to a determined purpose of shaking off the yoke of their oppressors. The story of William Tell has much the air of romance: it is, however, pretty well authenticated. The governor of Uri, a detestable tyrant, is said to have fixed his hat upon a pole in the market-place, with a strict injunction that all who passed should render obeisance to this symbol of dignity. Tell, who refused to pay this homage to the hat, was condemned to be hanged, but received his pardon, on condition of his hitting with an arrow

an apple which was placed upon his son's head. The father, fortunately, struck off the apple; but had reserved a second arrow for the governor, in case he had killed his son. This inhuman act of tyranny is said to have been the first alarm to a general revolt of the people, who immediately flew to arms and demolished all the fortresses in the province. Leopold, Arch-duke of Austria, marched against the insurgents with 20,000 men. The Swiss fought to the greatest advantage, by keeping to the rocky and inaccessible parts of the country. A small body, of 400 or 500 men, defeated the greatest part of this immense army in the pass of Morgarten: a defile which is said very much to resemble that at Thermopylæ, where the Lacedæmonians fought with less good fortune against the Persians. The rest of the cantons, encouraged by this success, joined the confederacy by degrees. The victory of Morgarten was gained in the year 1315. Bern, which is considered as the principal of the united cantons, did not enter into the alliance till 1352; and it was not till near two centuries after, that the last of the cantons joined the rest, which completed the number thirteen. The Swiss fought with great perseverance, and won their liberty extremely dear. They had no less than sixty pitched battles with the Austrians, and they have retained to this day that independence which they have so well merited.

The thirteen towns or cantons which properly constitute the Swiss or Helvetic republic were united by a reciprocal convention, of which the chief article relates to the mutual succours and

assistance to be furnished to any of the confederated states as should suffer from foreign attack or violence. The proportion of these succours was minutely stipulated. Another article of the convention stipulated the procedure in accommodating all domestic differences between the several cantons. Each of the cantons was, in all matters that regard not the national confederacy, an independent state. The form of government in the several states was very various. It was in some monarchical, in others aristocratical, and in others again democratical. In the monarchical states, some of the princes of the Germanic body were the sovereigns, as the Bishop of Basle, and the Abbot of St. Gall. Thus each state had its own form of government, and was regulated by its own particular laws, which it had an unlimited power of framing and of altering, and of modelling its own constitution. All affairs relating to the united confederacy were transacted either by letters or congresses. Letters from foreign powers to the whole confederacy were sent to the town of Zürich, and any proposal or notification from a town or canton, intended for general deliberation, was likewise transmitted thither, from whence it was officially circulated to all the other cantons, who either returned their opinion by letter, or, if the matter was doubtful or of great importance, appointed a conference to be held by two deputies from each of the states,—on which occasions a Deputy of Zürich sat as president of the assembly.

Thus the whole Helvetic body consisted properly of thirteen distinct, independent, and free

republics, united by convention for their mutual security and protection. The Helvetic body, for more than six centuries, supported itself in a respectable state of independence; made war, concluded treaties, modelled its own constitution, enacted laws and ordinances, both in affairs civil and ecclesiastical, and exercised all the various powers of sovereignty. Under the freedom of these republican constitutions the country of Switzerland came to be wonderfully improved. Where the lands are naturally fertile, and happily situated, they have been cultivated with the utmost skill and success; where nature has denied its advantages, art has amply supplied them. The produce of the country consists in corn, wine, oil, silk, and flax; and of the two last commodities, vast quantities are purchased from other neighbouring quarters, which the Swiss employ themselves in manufacturing. The situation of Switzerland, bounded as it is by Germany, Italy, and France, affords great convenience for the sale and dispersion of these manufactures; and there is a communication with the Mediterranean by the river Rhône, and with the German Ocean by the Rhine. Several great lakes afford an inland navigation; and these, and the rivers of the country, the industrious Swiss have turned to the utmost possible advantage. As there is rather a superabundance of population in this country, a great part of the youth were bred to the profession of arms. The art military was there a profitable branch of trade. The republics let out their troops for hire to other nations; and the French, Germans, Spa-

niards, Sicilians, and the Dutch, found high advantage in the employment of the Swiss mercenaries, who have occasionally constituted the most valuable and best-disciplined part of their armies. It is a remarkable fact, demonstrative both of the populousness of the country and the prevalence of the military profession above all others, that the single canton of Bern, which in extent of territory is not half the size of Yorkshire, was able to bring into the field 100,000 well-disciplined troops at the shortest warning.

The struggles which we have seen so long subsisting between the popes and the emperor, had produced nothing fixed as to the power and prerogatives of each, or as to the great question who should acknowledge the other's superiority. Henry VII. renewed his claim to Italy, and fought his way to Rome, where he was solemnly crowned, ordained all the princes of Italy to pay him an annual tribute, and styled himself Lord Paramount of the Pope. The pope, as is said, vindicated his rights, by employing a Dominican friar to poison the emperor in the consecrated wafer in which he took the sacrament.

Lewis of Bavaria, whom the Pope John XXII. had deprived and excommunicated, marching likewise to Rome, and holding a general council in the church of St. Peter's, solemnly deposed the pontiff and created a new one; but Lewis was called home by the troubles of Germany, and John regained his seat, while the emperor's pope was sent to prison. The papal seat was at this time at Avignon, a city which belonged to the counts of Provence; and it did not return to

Rome till the year 1377, when Gregory II., at the request of the citizens of Florence, who judged it might be for their advantage, brought back the residence of the popes to the Vatican.

Under Charles IV., the successor of Lewis of Bavaria, the empire of Germany assumed a more settled form of government than it had hitherto enjoyed. Charles published at Nuremberg that famous imperial constitution known by the name of The Golden Bull, which was in fact the first fundamental law of the Germanic body. This new constitution, which was made with the utmost possible solemnity, reduced the number of the German electors to seven, whereas, before, all the nobility or lords who were possessors of fiefs, and all the prelates, claimed right to vote in the election of an emperor. The seven electors were the archbishops of Mentz, Treves, and Cologne; the king of Bohemia, the Count Palatine, the duke of Saxony, and the margrave of Brandenburg. The Golden Bull assigned to each of the electors one of the great offices of the crown: the elections were ordered to be made at Frankfort; the emperor to be consecrated at Aix-la-Chapelle by the elector of Cologne; the first diet to be held at Nuremberg; the electorates to be inherited without division by the eldest sons according to the laws of primogeniture. The other articles of this celebrated bull regard little else than the pomp of the coronation, and the ceremonial of the court.

Whether the residence of the popes should be at Avignon or at Rome, was a question of no small consequence to the church. It was, in short,

a contest whether the clergy of Italy or of France should have the superiority. The French cardinals, at this time the majority of the conclave, being disgusted with the insolence of Urban, who was an Italian, retired to Naples and chose another pope, Clement VII. A short time after, another faction of the cardinals chose a third pope, John XXIII. Meantime the emperor Sigismund judged this division of the holy church to be a very proper occasion for his interfering to decide the dispute, and thus vindicate that imperial authority over the papal see, which had given birth to so many contests. For that purpose he summoned a general council of the church to meet at the city of Constance in Switzerland. Here Sigismund, who had surrounded the council with his army, ordered, in the first place, all the three popes to resign their dignity; and this being complied with, he next made the council elect a fourth person, Martin V., of the family of Colonna.

This important business being ended, Sigismund allowed the council to proceed to their spiritual concerns: and of this nature there were some of the transactions of this celebrated council so remarkable, as to attract the attention of all Europe.

John Huss, the father confessor of Queen Sophia of Bavaria, had read some of the books of Wickliffe, who, at this early time, had begun to open the eyes of the people of England to the papal usurpations and the scandalous lives of the pontiffs and their bishops. Wickliffe had gone a step further, and had attacked the doctrine of

transubstantiation. Huss did not meddle with these abstruse points, but railed against the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the disorderly lives of the popes and bishops. He was cited to appear before the Council of Constance, and was examined touching the most obnoxious passages of his writings. To deny the hierarchy, and to reproach the conduct and morals of the bishops, were sufficient crimes in the judgment of a council of these bishops, and Huss was condemned to be burnt alive. He might have saved his life by simply declaring that he abjured all his errors. The emperor Sigismund, who wanted to save him, thus reasoned with him:—"What harm can there be," said he, "in any man declaring that he abjures his errors? I am ready this moment to declare that I abjure all my errors;" but John Huss was too sincere to save his life by an equivocation, and he suffered death with heroic courage.

A few months afterwards, Jerome of Prague the discipline and the friend of John Huss, underwent the same fate with his master. He was a man of superior talents and of great eloquence. The fear of death was at first too powerful, and he signed a recantation of his opinions; but no sooner had he heard how his master had encountered death than he was ashamed to live. He publicly retracted his recantation, preached forth his doctrines, and was condemned to the flames. He made a speech to his judges, which Poggio, the Florentine, who heard it, declares was equal to the finest specimen of Greek or Roman eloquence. "He spoke," says he, "like a So-

crates, and walked to the kindled pile with as much serenity as that great philosopher displayed when he drank the poisoned cup."

These executions were attended with consequences to the Emperor of which he had little expectation. The succession to the kingdom of Bohemia opened to him by the death of his brother Winceslaus; but the Bohemians were so exasperated at the fate of their two countrymen, that it cost Sigismund a bloody war of sixteen years' continuance before he acquired the full possession of these dominions.

CHAPTER XII.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries—Deputies from Burghs first called to Parliament—Edward I.—Conquest of Wales—Scotland—obscurity of its early History—Malcolm Canmore—David I.—Alexander III.—Bruce and Baliol Competitors for the Crown—Designs of Edward against Scotland—Sir William Wallace—Battles of Falkirk and Stirling—Death of Wallace—Robert Bruce—Edward II.—Battle of Bannockburn—Edward III.—Battle of Halidown Hill—Invasion of France—The Black Prince—Battle of Cressy—of Durham—of Poictiers—Richard II.—Henry IV.

AFTER the death of John, that wicked and detestable tyrant, we saw his son, the young Henry III., crowned under the auspices of the earl of Pembroke, the protector; and the abdication of Lewis, who found it in vain to persist in his endeavours to possess himself of the kingdom which was now united, to a man, against him. Henry III. had not the vicious disposition of his father, but he was a weak and contemptible prince; fitted to be abused and trampled on by those aspiring barons who had so lately vindicated and extended their rights. Through the whole course of his reign, the kingdom was embroiled in commotions, which proceeded chiefly from the weak and mean policy of Henry in bestowing his offices of trust on foreigners, in

order to be a check on the turbulent disposition of the English. These commotions, unimportant in the main in their effects, produced, however, one consequence well deserving observation. Simon Montfort, earl of Leicester, son of that Montford whom we have lately beheld as the head of the crusade against the Albigenses, encouraged by the weakness of his sovereign, and his own power and popularity, resolved to attempt an innovation in the government, and to wrest the sceptre from the hand of Henry. He called a meeting of the barons, from whom, whoever, he concealed his particular scheme, and an association was entered into for the redress of public grievances. The king, to appease the growing disorders, summoned a Parliament at Oxford, where he agreed that certain persons of authority—twenty-four barons—should be appointed to digest a new plan of government. At the head of these was Montfort, and their measures contained the first *regular plan* of the British House of Commons. It was ordered that each county should choose four knights, who should examine into the grievances of their respective constituents, and attend at the ensuing Parliament to give information of their complaints. These knights of the shires soon exemplified their power against the very persons to whom they owed it. The twenty-four barons, under Leicester, began to overturn the whole arrangement of the offices of government, and to substitute creatures of their own in place of those who had formerly filled them. They delegated to twelve persons appointed by themselves

the whole powers of parliament, and seemed resolved to continue themselves in office for ever; thus substituting a vile oligarchy in place of the constitution of the kingdom. The knights of the shires, who now perceived their aim, and the aspiring views of their leader the earl of Leicester, began to show a very laudable spirit. They remonstrated against the continuance of this junto in office; and they called upon the king's eldest son, prince Edward, a youth of noble spirit and most promising abilities, to interpose his authority, and to save England from perdition.

Edward was at this time about twenty-two years of age. He acted with the utmost propriety; and without openly taking the reins from the hands of a father who was unable to hold them, he adopted every measure, apparently under the king's authority, for vindicating his dignity and the interests of the kingdom.

Leicester now began to show the motives of his conduct without reserve. He had raised a formidable army in Wales, assisted by the prince of that province. The citizens of London, with their mayor, Thomas Fitz-Richard, a furious and lawless man, were likewise in his interest. Henry himself, intimidated by this vigorous opposition, meanly acquiesced in all the demands of Leicester. The twenty-four barons were established in office during the life both of the king and prince Edward; and all the castles and fortresses surrendered into their hands. Prince Edward followed another line of conduct: he summoned the vassals of the crown to arm in the defence of their lord and of the

kingdom, and soon collected an army with which he was able to take the field against the rebellious Leicester and his associates; but the impetuosity of his disposition involved him in misfortune. In the battle of Lewes, while he imprudently pursued one wing of the enemy, which he had routed and put to flight, the main body, under the more cool and deliberate Leicester, had cut off the best part of the royal army and taken king Henry prisoner. Edward in his return was surrounded, with his small body of troops, and forced to submit to the conqueror, who now procured a full ratification of all the measures of the confederated barons. Leicester, possessed of the persons of the king and of the prince, in fact ruled the kingdom. In order to confirm his authority, he called a parliament, where, on the part of the people, two knights were summoned from each of the counties, and also deputies from the boroughs, which had hitherto been regarded as too inconsiderable to have a voice in the legislation. This is the first confirmed plan of the English House of Commons.

This parliament, which Leicester, trusting to his popularity and power, expected was to second all his views, did not turn out to be so submissive as he could have wished: many of its members spoke their sentiments with freedom, and urged the re-establishment of the ancient government of the kingdom, and Leicester was prudent enough to make a merit of what he saw he could not prevent. He released prince Edward from confinement, who no sooner re-

ceived his liberty than, indignant that ever it had been abridged by a rebellious subject, he raised an army, marched against his enemy, whom he attacked before he was aware of his having taken the field, and Leicester, after a most bloody and obstinate fight of seven hours, was defeated and killed. Henry was now re-established in his kingdom by the hands of his gallant son, who had no sooner given peace to England than his enterprising spirit engaged him in the last crusade with Lewis IX., on which expedition he had scarce departed when the weak and pusillanimous Henry died, after a reign of fifty-six years—the longest to be met with in the annals of England, and, but for that one circumstance which we have particularly mentioned, the rise of the House of Commons—the least important.

Prince Edward, now Edward I., and known by the surname of Longshanks, was a monarch of a great and enterprising spirit, a prince whose ambition had no bounds, and who, in the gratification of that ruling passion was not always actuated by the principles of justice and humanity. After signalising himself in Palestine, and in a very honourable manner giving peace to the Eastern countries, by a truce concluded for ten years with the sultan of Babylon, he was on his way returning home when he received intelligence of his father's death. He succeeded to an undisputed throne; and he found matters in such a situation, the barons so exhausted with their late contentions, and his own character so high on account of the heroic part he had sustained,

both at home and abroad, that he might safely have pushed his authority any length; but he was naturally prudent, and though capable of becaming absolute, he satisfied himself with moderate power: he even confirmed the Magna Charta, which, from that time, as being acceded to by one of the boldest and most powerful of the English monarchs, began to be considered as solemnly and unalterably established.

The genius of Edward could not rest without an object of enterprise—he projected the conquest of Wales. Llewellyn, prince of North Wales, had refused to do homage for his dominions, and seemed determined to shake off all submission to the crown of England. The Welsh, who were the remains of the ancient Britons who had escaped the Roman and Saxon conquest*, still preserved their freedom, their own laws, their customs, and their language. Edward determined to subject them entirely to the crown of England; and the refusal of Llewellyn, who had formerly acknowledged his subjection, gave him a favourable pretext. He invaded Wales with an immense army, and cooped up Llewellyn among the mountains of Snowdon, whither he had betaken himself with his troops, as deeming those heights inaccessible to strangers; but *they* were *barren heights*, and the army of Edward prevented all supplies of provisions. The Welsh were, in short, compelled to submit at discretion. Edward dictated the terms of submission, which were, the relinquishment of a large

* See Blackstone's Comment. Introd. § 4.

part of the country, the payment of fifty thousand pounds sterling, and a consent of the prince to do homage, and swear fealty to the crown of England; in consideration of which the Welsh were allowed to enjoy their own laws. Some encroachments upon the borders soon invited the Welsh to infringe this treaty, and Edward marched his army into the heart of the country, where, for some time, he met with the most frantic and desperate opposition. At length, a decisive battle, fought in the year 1283, determined for ever the fate of Wales. Llewellyn was killed, and with him expired the government and the distinction of his nation. Wales was soon after formally united to the kingdom of England, and the title of its principality has ever since been borne by the eldest son of the king. Some circumstances of extreme barbarity marked this conquest upon the part of Edward. The Welsh bards kept alive an heroic spirit of freedom and independence, by rehearsing in their songs the glorious achievements of the ancient Britons: Edward ordered these unhappy minstrels to be massacred wherever they were found.

Mr. Hume, in mentioning this fact, which is well authenticated, admits the inhumanity of Edward's conduct, but seems to justify it on the score of prudence. "The king," says he, "from a barbarous, though not absurd policy, ordered the bards to be put to death." If the death of all that were alive of these unhappy men could have extinguished the profession and talents of a *bard*, or put an end at once to all remembrance of those heroic songs which had

been handed down by memory from one generation to another, and which every Welshman had heard from his cradle,—then might the policy of Edward have been a wise one; but as the natural consequence of this inhuman measure in the breasts of the Welsh must have been the perpetuation of those very songs, and an increased abhorrence of their conqueror, and disaffection to his government, we cannot scruple to say that, in this instance, the policy of the king of England was as absurd as it was barbarous. The memory of this event, so inglorious to Edward, is secured for ever by the sublime ode of Gray upon the death of the Welsh Bards.

The conquest of Wales paved the way for enterprises of more importance, though not attended with such permanent consequences. These were the designs of Edward upon Scotland. That ancient kingdom has made many noble struggles for her liberty and independence, and none more remarkable than against this bold, ambitious, and designing prince. But in order to understand the foundation of those pretences on which Edward founded his claims of sovereignty over this kingdom, it is necessary to take a short view of the history of Scotland previous to the period of which we now treat.

The history of Scotland, before the accession of Malcolm III., surnamed Canmore (i. e. *Great-Head*), is involved in obscurity and fable.

Malcolm Canmore, after having subdued and put to death the usurper Macbeth, the murderer of his father Duncan, succeeded to the throne of Scotland in the year 1057. He had been aided

in the recovery of his kingdom by the English, and was therefore disposed to have cultivated a friendship with that nation. But William the Norman having accomplished the conquest of England, Edgar Atheling, the heir of the Saxon line, together with his sister Margaret, took refuge in Scotland; and the reception given them by Malcolm, and his subsequent marriage with the princess Margaret, could not fail to set the two nations at variance. The frequent insurrections of the English nobles in favour of the heir of their former kings—who, destitute of personal merit, had nothing but that title to recommend him—produced a succession of hostilities between William the Conqueror and Malcolm, which were equally prejudicial to both kingdoms. In one of these expeditions, in which William advanced pretty far into Scotland, it is alleged that the Scottish monarch, after concluding a truce, did homage to the conqueror for his kingdom of Scotland. A passage in the Saxon Chronicle, which simply says, "that Malcolm agreed with king William of England, and did him homage," was the foundation of a claim of sovereignty over this kingdom by the succeeding monarchs, which involved both nations in much bloodshed. It is foreign to my purpose to enter into critical discussions of controverted points of history. It seems, however, generally allowed that this claim of sovereignty has no solid foundation. It has never been disputed that the crown of England was imperial and independent; though its kings were for many ages the vassals of the French monarchs, and bound to feudal

homage for those possessions which they held *in the kingdom of France*. Such likewise was the condition of the monarchs of Scotland—free and independent as kings, but, as possessing English territories, vassals to the crown of England *in those territories*. Malcolm Canmore, above all monarchs, would never have stooped to so mean a submission as that of doing homage for his *kingdom*. He was a prince of high spirit, and of steady and inflexible courage. In the course of a reign of twenty-seven years, he supported the contest with England, under William the Conqueror and his son Rufus, often with great success, and never without honour. To him, and perhaps yet more to the virtues of his queen, the Scottish nation were indebted for that dawning of civilisation which is the consequence of wise laws, and a steady administration of government.

The short succeeding reigns of Donald Bane, the brother, and of Duncan II., and Edgar, sons of Malcolm Canmore, scarcely merit notice. On the death of the latter, Alexander I., third son of Canmore, ascended the throne—a prince of high, uncontrollable spirit. He defended most strenuously the independence of the national church against the pretensions of the metropolitan sees of York and Canterbury,—a contest carried on with as much animosity as the more celebrated disputes of the same nature between the emperors and the popedom; and had the independence of his kingdom been at that time called in question, he would have asserted it with equal courage and resolution.

His successor, David I., the youngest of the sons of Malcolm Canmore, was an honour to his country and to monarchy. Though defeated by the English in the great battle of the Standard, he maintained, upon the whole, a very successful war; and, by treaty with Stephen, he secured, as an appanage of his crown, the whole earldom of Northumberland. More ambitious, however, of cultivating the arts of peace than of extending the limits of his kingdom, he endeavoured to the utmost to repress those barbarous invasions which were equally destructive to his subjects and to their neighbours; and such were the wisdom and excellence of his domestic administration, that Buchanan himself, an historian whose principles are, on the whole, unfavourable to monarchy, has declared his opinion, that a more perfect pattern of a good king is to be found in the reign of David I. of Scotland, than in all the theories of the learned and ingenious. He was succeeded by his grandson, Malcolm IV.

In these reigns there was no pretence made by the English monarchs of a feudal dependency of the kingdom of Scotland. An accidental misfortune, which befel one of the Scottish kings, first encouraged the English to think of bringing this kingdom under dependence. William, surnamed the Lion, the grandson of David I., was taken prisoner at Alnwick; and Henry II., as the price of his liberty, not only extorted from him an exorbitant ransom, and a promise to surrender the places of the greatest strength in his dominions, but compelled him to do homage for

his whole kingdom. Richard Cœur de Lion, a prince of more generosity, solemnly renounced this claim, and absolved William from the hard conditions which Henry had imposed. Upon the death of Alexander III., Edward I., availing himself of the situation of affairs in Scotland, revived that absurd claim of sovereignty; and, after a happy period of above a century of peace and good understanding between the nations, began a lengthened series of calamities, bloodshed, and devastation.

As Alexander III. left no male issue, nor any descendant except Margaret (called the Maid of Norway,) his granddaughter, who did not long survive him, the right of succession devolved to the posterity of David, earl of Huntingdon, third son of David I. Of that line there appeared two illustrious competitors for the crown—Robert Bruce, son of Isabella, second daughter of the earl of Huntingdon; and John Baliol, grandson of Margaret, the earl's eldest daughter. As the rules of succession are *now* understood, the right of Baliol, the grandson of the eldest daughter, was clearly preferable. But in those days the order of succession was not so certainly established, and each competitor had his pretensions supported by a formidable party in the kingdom. To avoid a civil war, which must otherwise have taken place, the candidates agreed to a measure which had very near proved fatal to the independence of the kingdom. They chose Edward I. of England to be umpire of the contest; and this ambitious and artful prince determined to avail himself of the powers thus bestowed on

him, and to arrogate to himself the sovereignty of Scotland. He summoned all the Scottish barons to attend him at the castle of Norham, in Northumberland; and having gained some, and intimidated others, he prevailed on the whole assembly to acknowledge Scotland a fief of the English crown, and to swear allegiance to him as their sovereign or liege lord.

He next demanded possession of the kingdom that he might be able to deliver it to him whose right should be found preferable; and such was the dastardly pusillanimity of all present, whom Edward had intimidated by bringing with him a very formidable army, that this exorbitant demand was likewise complied with, both by the barons and the competitors for the crown. One man alone, worthy of an eternal memorial, Gilbert de Umphraville, earl of Angus, sustained the honour of his country, and peremptorily refused to deliver up those castles which he held from the Scottish kings. Edward, who believed Baliol the least formidable of the competitors, adjudged the question in his favour, and put him in possession of the kingdom, after making him solemnly take the oath of fidelity to himself as *lord paramount*, and subscribe to every condition which he thought proper to require. But the Scots were not long patient under their state of subjection. Edward found himself deceived in the character of Baliol, who determined very soon to get free from that yoke of dependence to which the necessity of circumstances had compelled him to submit. The king of England having summoned him, as a vassal, to answer in

his courts to an appeal, at the instance of his Scottish subjects, he, on that occasion, maintained his independence as a sovereign, and soon after, with the consent of his parliament, solemnly renounced the allegiance and fealty which he had sworn to Edward. This renunciation was fatal to Baliol, while it was highly favourable tot he political views of Edward. He marched a numerous army immediately into Scotland, to which the distracted state of the country rendered it impossible to oppose an adequate resistance. He carried everything before him, and the unfortunate Baliol was compelled to implore the mercy of his conqueror, who obliged him to abdicate the throne, and resign the kingdom itself into his hands, and remain a prisoner in England.

In this state of universal despondency arose William Wallace, a man who deserves to be numbered among the heroes of antiquity. With no advantages of birth or fortune, conscious of his personal merits alone, with an invincible spirit, a courage equal to the greatest attempts, and every requisite quality of a consummate general, he undertook to retrieve the honour and the liberties of his country. A few patriots joined him in that glorious attempt, and his confessed superiority of merit bestowed on him the rank of their chief and leader. Taking advantage of an expedition of the English monarch into Flanders, while the government of Scotland had been instrusted to an imperious viceroy, Wallace with his associates began hostilities by an assault upon some of the strongest castles

which contained English garrisons. Of these they made themselves masters by force or by surprise; and finding from these advantages their numbers daily increasing, they ventured to oppose a regular army of the English who met them under the command of the viceroy near to Stirling. The stratagem, related by Buchanan, of sawing across the posts of the bridge, over which the English inconsiderately ventured to pass, is of a piece with those many fabulous exploits recorded of Wallace which are beyond all historical credit. The Scots owed their success in the battle of Stirling to their valour in the field. The English were completely routed; they evacuated the country, and Scotland was once more a free kingdom. William Wallace assumed now the title of Governor of Scotland under John Baliol, who still remained a prisoner. But this title, which he had so well merited, drew on him the jealousy of the chief nobility, particularly the partisans of Bruce, who meanly continued to rank themselves under the banners of the English tyrant. Edward, now returned from the Continent, hastened to Scotland at the head of an army of 80,000 men, while the Scots in the interior parts of the country were collecting all their strength to oppose him. But dissensions among their leaders had weakened their patriotic bands, and their numbers were greatly inferior to the enemy. Had they artfully protracted the campaign, instead of hazarding a general engagement, the English, who were then ill supplied with provisions, must, in all probability, have been compelled to an inglorious

retreat. But, with imprudent impetuosity, they desired to be led on to action. An engagement ensued at Falkirk, in which the Scots were routed with prodigious loss. Yet even the success of that day was a convincing proof to Edward that it was vain to hope for a complete conquest of the country. The remnant of the Scottish army continued still in the field. The whole country north of the river Forth was hostile to Edward, who, being constantly obliged during the winter, to evacuate the kingdom, found, at the beginning of every new campaign, that he had to recommence his labours. At length, highly provoked, and resolutely determined on the entire conquest of the country, Edward concluded peace with his enemies on the Continent, in order to bend his whole strength to terminate, as he called it, the rebellion of the Scots. He brought with him an immense army, and penetrating into the northern provinces, he took and garrisoned all the places of strength. Hence, returning southward, the only fortress capable of opposing him was the castle of Stirling, where the Scots were determined to make their last stand for the national liberty. But the event was unsuccessful; they gave way to the immense superiority of the English army, and the chief of the Scottish barons threw down their arms and submitted to the conqueror. A capitulation was signed by Edward, from which William Wallace, and a few of the most resolute of his adherents, were excepted by name. These brave men, now reduced to the condition of fugitives, concealed themselves in remote parts of

the country; while Edward, with a policy which must ever be reckoned mean and dastardly, endeavoured by high rewards to prompt a discovery of the places of their retreat; and that policy was successful. Wallace was betrayed by Menteith, a vile traitor, who had been in his confidence and friendship. He was given up into the hands of the conqueror; who, with consistent meanness and inhumanity, refined upon the cruelty of his fate by every species of contumely and wanton insult. The deliverer of his country was conducted to London, led in triumph through the streets, and seated on a mock throne in Westminster Hall, his head crowned with laurel. He was arraigned as a traitor to Edward, as having risen in arms against his sovereign, and put to death many of his subjects. "I never was a traitor," said Wallace; "I owe no allegiance to Edward; and I challenge all of you to produce a single instance in which I have ever acknowledged the king of England to be the *lord paramount*, far less the *sovereign, of my country!*" To the rest of the indictment, his having put to death many of the English, he pleaded guilty. Sentence was passed; he was beheaded; his head placed upon a pinnacle of the city; and his body, cut into many portions, was distributed throughout the different cities of Scotland and England. Thus died one of the best of patriots and bravest of men *.

* Lord Hailes, in his 'Annals,' disputes the fact of Wallace being betrayed by Menteith, and has raised an historical contro-

Thus, after a long and obstinate contest, Scotland was a second time reduced under the domi-

versy, which his Lordship conducts with no great candour. In his first edition, he asserts the story to rest solely on the authority of Blind Harry. In a note, added to his second edition, he is obliged to admit that he has been reminded of another authority, that of Arnold Blair; and he disposes of it by the gratuitous assertion, that the passage referred to is evidently an interpolation of some patriotic and passionate transcriber. The passage is certainly marked both by patriotism and passion; but had Lord Hailes informed his reader that Arnold Blair was a priest, and the domestic chaplain of Wallace, he would have sufficiently accounted for these characteristics, and shown that such an authority was not to be disposed of by a gratuitous allegation. The passage, considered as the lament of a faithful servant over a beloved master, is a striking one, and, as an authority, worth a volume of historical criticism written after the lapse of five centuries. "And here it is to be observed, that these three things concur to immortalise the name of the noble Wallace—his own innocence—the tyranny of Edward—and the treachery of Menteith. Accursed be the day of John Menteith's nativity!—and may his name be blotted out of the book of life! Accursed be the inhuman tyrant that put him to death! while the noble champion of the Scots shall, for the reward of his virtue, have glory without end. Amen!"

But the author of the 'Annals' knew well that the treason of Menteith rested yet on another, and also a contemporary authority—that of John Fordun. The eighth chapter of the twelfth book of the Scotichronicon is entitled 'De proditione Johannis de Menteth, morte Willelmi Wallace', &c.; and the chapter begins, 'Hoc eodem anno nobilis Willelmus Wallace per Dominum Johannem de Menteth, apud Glasgow, nihil mali suspicians, fraudulenter et proditionaliter capitur.' This latter part of the Scotichronicon was arranged by Bowyer, from the materials of Fordun; but Bowyer lived but a few years later, and is at least of equal authority. There seems, then, no ground for preferring the *ipse dixit* of Lord Hailes to cotemporary testimony such as this, confirmed by general and continued tradition from that age to the present.

nion of Edward—a subjection which, however, was but of a few months' continuance. Scotland found a second champion and deliverer in Robert Bruce, the grandson of the competitor. His father and grandfather had meanly enlisted themselves among the partisans of the English monarch; and by their example, this young man too had sworn allegiance, along with most of the barons of the kingdom. But his native magnanimity kindling with his years, his noble spirit could not brook the fallen honours and humiliation of his country. He determined to vindicate its liberty or die in the attempt; and hastily withdrawing himself from the court of Edward, he again set up the standard of war in Scotland. "Better," said he to his partisans, "if Heaven should so decree, that we perish at once like brave men, than drag on with ignominy a life of servitude and oppression."

The circumstances which attended the first operations of Bruce towards the recovery of his country's liberties are variously related by historians. It is certain, however, that the spirit of the nation roused itself at once from its dejection; the English were attacked at the same time on every quarter; they were dispossessed of all the fortresses, and once more entirely driven out of the kingdom. Bruce, in right of the just pretensions of his family, now that Baliol had relinquished all claim in favour of his conqueror, was solemnly crowned king at Scone; while the enraged Edward hastily advancing with a prodigious army, died at Carlisle, and left the throne

of England, with his empty claim to the kingdom of Scotland, to his son Edward II. This prince inherited none of the great qualities of his father; he was a weak and indolent man, but of humane and benevolent affections. The social dispositions, the most amiable which distinguish human nature, are often dangerous ingredients in the character of a prince. Such was the disposition of Edward, that he could not be happy without the society of some mean favourite, to whom he might unbosom every secret of his breast. Piers Gaveston, a young man of beautiful figure and of shining accomplishments, had so fascinated the mind of Edward that he thought no reward equal to his deserts. He bestowed on him the earldom of Cornwall, married him to his own niece, and during a journey he undertook to Paris, to marry the princess Isabella, left him guardian of the realm. The barons, who could not bear this upstart, determined his ruin. They assembled a tumultuous parliament and a numerous train of armed followers, and compelled the weak Edward to sign a commission delegating the whole authority of government to twelve persons to be chosen by themselves. The king patiently submitted to be stripped of power; but it cost him a severe pang to abandon his favourite to destruction. This, however, he was compelled to do, and Gaveston was thrown into prison, whence endeavouring a short time after to make his escape, he was seized and instantly beheaded. A truce which had been concluded

with Scotland, in the beginning of the reign of this weak prince, had been infringed on both sides; and Edward now prepared with an immense army of 100,000 men to reduce the country to submission, and fulfil the dying request of his father, by making a complete conquest of it. King Robert Bruce met him at Bannockburn, near Stirling, with 30,000 men. By an excellent disposition of the Scottish army, and the signal intrepidity and conduct of the king, the English were totally routed. A prodigious slaughter ensued, and the pursuit continued near 100 miles, till the small remnant of this immense army was entirely driven out of the kingdom. Edward narrowly escaped by flight to Dunbar, whence he was conveyed by sea to his own dominions. This great and decisive victory secured the independence of Scotland, and fixed Robert Bruce firmly upon the throne. It made a deep impression on the minds of the English, and for several years after no superiority of numbers could induce them to keep the field against their formidable adversaries.

The despicable Edward returned to London, where he had no resource but in the society of a new favourite, one Spenser, who soon became equally odious to the barons and to the queen Isabella. This bad woman, who hated and dishonoured her husband, was allowed to go to France, to mediate with her brother Charles the Fair, who threatened to confiscate Edward's continental dominions, unless he came in person

to do him homage for them. She found means to get her son young Edward likewise sent over, and then boldly declared that neither should ever return to England till Spenser was banished the kingdom. By these means she gained two advantages: she became popular in England, where Spenser was universally hated; and she enjoyed the company of Mortimer, a young nobleman now the object of her capricious affections, who had escaped from the Tower, where he had been confined for high treason. Isabella, encouraged by her brother, prepared to levy war against her husband. She was seconded by a powerful party in the kingdom; and concluding a match between young Edward and the daughter of the Earl of Hainault and Holland, she procured from that prince a powerful supply of troops. At length she repassed into England, Mortimer, her paramour, at the head of her troops: while the king fled before them with his favourite Spenser, whose father, an old man of ninety, in vain attempted to defend the castle of Bristol against the rebels. A mutiny of the garrison gave him up into their hands; and such was their inhumanity and savage fury, that after hanging him on a gibbet, they cut his body to pieces and threw it to the dogs. Young Spenser soon after underwent the same fate: he was taken lurking in a convent in Wales, immediately brought out to execution, hanged, and cut to pieces. At length the king, abandoned by his subjects, persecuted by his unnatural queen, and a fugitive in his own kingdom, was taken prisoner,

removed to London, where he was insulted by the populace, confined in the Tower, tried by the parliament, and by a solemn sentence deposed from the throne. The crown was given to his son, who was then only fourteen years of age, and the regency to the queen. Edward did not long remain a prisoner: he is said to have been put to death in a manner shocking to humanity.

The young Edward, kept in bondage by his mother, and her lover the ambitious Mortimer, had no share of blame in these infamous transactions. The noble spirit of this prince soon shook off the fetters, and amply revenged the death of his father. The queen and Mortimer chose Nottingham Castle, a place of great strength, for their residence. By connivance with the governor, some noblemen, at the king's request, found their way into the favourite's apartment, and carried him off in spite of Isabella's prayers and tears. The parliament immediately condemned him to death, and he instantly underwent the fate he had inflicted on the Spencers. Edward sentenced his mother to perpetual imprisonment, in which she lived for twenty-five years a miserable monument of criminal and blasted ambition.

Thus freed from the controul of usurped authority, the noble spirit of Edward III. began to meditate the most important enterprises. Edward Baliol, whose father, John, had been crowned king of Scotland, applied to the monarch of England to assist him in his pretensions to the kingdom. Some troops were granted, with which Baliol was so far successful as to get

himself crowned at Scone; but he was afterwards defeated, and obliged a second time to fly for protection to England. Edward now determined to assist him in person; and marching northward, besieged and took the town of Berwick, when he was opposed, at Halidown Hill, by Sir Archibald Douglas, the Scottish general. Both armies engaged with equal keenness, but Douglas was slain, and the Scots were defeated. Near 30,000 men are said to have fallen in this engagement, among whom were the chief of the Scottish nobility. Edward returned in triumph to England, having fixed Baliol, his vassal and tributary, upon the throne. But the kingdom was as repugnant as ever to the domination of England, and, animated by hopes of assistance from France, renewed hostilities immediately upon Edward's departuue.

That monarch prepared now for a new enterprise, which drew after it a train of the most important consequences. The succession to the kingdom of France was then in dispute, and Edward embraced a notion which found great countenance in his ambitious disposition, that he had the best title by inheritance, in right of his mother, the sister of Charles the Fair. Philip of Valois, however, the male heir, had in the meantime taken possession of the throne *.

* Philip contended that the Salic law excluded the pretensions of his rival. The English lawyers acknowledged that a female heir was excluded by the Salic law on account of the weakness of her sex, but urged that the exclusion went no farther than her own person, and that her son's right was not affected. The question was pleaded in the Court of the Peers of France, and decided in favour of Philip.

Edward, who wanted but a pretext for an enterprise so suitable to his disposition, styled himself King of France, and prepared immediately for an invasion of that realm. A naval engagement ensued on the coast of Flanders, in which the French lost 230 ships and 30,000 seamen. Edward landing in France with the chief of the nobility of England, and his son, called, from the colour of his armour, the *Black Prince*, then a youth of fifteen years of age, ran a career of the most glorious exploits. The opulent city of Caen in Normandy was taken and plundered, and the English were extending their depredations almost to the gates of Paris, when Philip appeared in their front with an army of 100,000 men. Edward had no more than 30,000, yet notwithstanding this prodigious inequality, he resolved to indulge the ardour of his troops, and come to a decisive battle. They met upon a plain near the village of Cressy, and here ensued one of the most memorable engagements recorded in history. After a most judicious arrangement of his army, Edward and the Prince of Wales received the sacrament with the utmost devotion; and showed by the calm intrepidity of their conduct, that the resolved alternative was victory or death. This behaviour influenced the whole army of the English, who stood to receive the first shock of the enemy with composed and sullen fortitude. A shower of arrows from the English archers began the engagement, which throwing that wing of the French to whom they were opposed into the utmost confusion, the Prince of Wales, taking advantage of their dismay, attacked them

with irresistible impetuosity. The king, who commanded a body of reserve, was determined to allow his intrepid son the honour of the day; he kept aloof from the fight, which was maintained on both sides with the most desperate courage. Some of the nobles, apprehensive for the safety of their prince, despatched a messenger to the king, desiring that a reinforcement might be sent to his relief. Edward first demanded if his son was alive, and being answered in the affirmative, and that he was showing prodigies of valour: "Then tell him," says he, "that the glory of the day shall be *his* alone; let him show himself worthy of the honour of knighthood, with which I have lately invested him *." This speech, reported to the Prince, inspired him with new courage. Alençon, the bravest of the French generals, was slain, and the whole army began to give way to the irresistible fury of the English. Philip, while he exerted every nerve to turn the tide of victory, was compelled to quit the field by one of his own barons, who seizing his horse by the reins, forced him to abandon the combat. The French

* This incident is well told by Froissart. "Then the king said, 'Is my son dead, or hurt, or on the earth felled?' 'No, Sir,' quoth the knight, 'but he is hardly matched, wherefore he hath need of your aid.' 'Well,' said the king, 'return to him, and to those that sent you hither, and say to them, that they send no more to me for any adventure that falleth, so long as my son is alive; and also say to them that they suffer him this day to win his spurs; for if God be pleased, I will this journée be his and the honour thereof, and to them that be about him.'"—Lord Berners' Froissart, vol. i. cap. 30.

were entirely defeated. 30,000 were left dead on the spot. Among these were John, king of Bohemia; Ralph, duke of Lorrain, and a great part of the chief nobility of France. The crest of the king of Bohemia, which was three ostrich feathers, from that day became the arms of the Prince of Wales in commemoration of the signal battle of Cressy, which was fought on the 26th day of August, 1346. This epoch was signalised by one of the most important discoveries that has ever been made, the invention of artillery. Some pieces of cannon, which, it is said, Edward had placed in the front of his army, contributed much to throw the enemy into confusion, and to give victory to the English. This invention, apparently a most destructive one, has certainly, upon the whole, proved beneficial to society. Nations are more upon a level, as less depends upon frantic exertions of courage and consequently, from a consideration of an equality of strength, the peace of kingdoms is better preserved.—The victory of Cressy was followed by the siege and reduction of Calais, which, from that time, remained for two hundred and ten years in the possession of the English.

While these important proceedings were transacted on the continent, the miseries of war were doubled by one of the most dreadful pestilences recorded in history. Asia and Africa were almost depopulated by it; and in the west of Europe it raged with incredible fury. The Scotch, involved in the common calamity, were yet determined to take advantage of this conjuncture of distress, and while the best of the English troops

were on the continent, to make a formidable invasion of that kingdom. David Bruce, then a child, at the head of an army of 50,000 men, invaded and ravaged the north of England to the gates of Durham. The queen, Philippa, a most heroic woman, and worthy to be the wife of Edward, assembled hastily a body of 12,000 men, of which she gave the command to Lord Percy. She animated the army, however, by her own presence, rode through the ranks, and quitted them only in the moment of engagement. The Scots received a fatal overthrow, 15,000 were left dead on the field; and David, their young king, with several of the chief nobility, was carried in triumph to London. In the meantime Philip of Valois died, and was succeeded in the throne of France by his son John. He was a weak, cruel, and tyrannical prince; though his distresses have thrown the most favourable veil upon his character. A truce had been concluded soon after the taking of Calais between Edward and Philip. It was dissolved upon the death of the latter, and hostilities recommenced. The Black Prince, with an army of 12,000 men, was sent into France, and carried devastation into the heart of the kingdom. John took the field against him with 60,000 men, and advanced towards Poictiers, with the design of surrounding and cutting him off at once. The military skill displayed by the prince in the arrangement of his little army was admirable. He contrived to give them the appearance of numbers, while he even diminished them in reality, by placing a considerable body of his troops in ambuscade,

The French had to march through a lane to the attack. The Black Prince, with one division, opposed them on the front, while his main body, divided into two, poured down upon their lengthened flank. The confusion of the enemy was completed by the troops in ambuscade, and this immense army was dispersed and cut to pieces. King John himself, with one of his sons, was taken. The moderation of the Prince of Wales was equal to his heroism. He treated the captive monarch with every distinction due to his rank; he refused to be seated in his presence; and, when he conducted his royal prisoner to London amidst the acclamations of the people, he rode himself on the left hand on a small black palfrey, while John upon the right was mounted on a horse remarkable for his beauty and rich accoutrements. Thus, two monarchs were at the same time prisoners in London, David of Scotland, and John of France.

But whatever had been won in France was successively, and, in a manner, silently lost without the mortification of a defeat. John, who was in the power of the English, could make no treaties which had the force to bind his kingdom. The Dauphin and the states of France carried on the war with great vigour; but, at the same time, so cautiously as not to hazard a general engagement. By this procedure, which was extremely politic, Edward was wearied and harassed into a treaty, in which he consented to renounce all claim to the sovereignty of France; but it was agreed that he should retain possession of Poitou, St. Onge, Perigord, and some of the neighbour-

ing districts, together with Calais, and several towns on that quarter. John was sent back to his dominions on promise of a large ransom; but he was without finances, without soldiers, for they refused to obey him, and without credit; yet he had a strong principle of honour, for, being unable to satisfy the conditions of his liberation, he returned to England, surrendered himself once more a prisoner, and died soon after in London*.

Charles, surnamed the Wise, succeeded his father John in the crown of France, and by his excellent political talents, retrieved the losses and miseries of his country. He quelled a most formidable insurrection of banditti called Malandrins, who were a terror to the whole nation. He even formed them into a body of regular troops, and led them into the kingdom of Castile, against Pedro, surnamed the Cruel, whom his subjects had dethroned, and who was endeavouring, with the aid of the English, to regain his dominions. This caused a renewal of hostilities between the French and English. The Black Prince marched into Castile, and in conjunction with Pedro, engaged and defeated the French under Henry of Transtamara and Bertrand de Guesclin, one of the most consummate generals of the age. The arms of England again prevailed.

* It was a noble maxim of this prince, "That if good faith should be totally forgotten by the rest of mankind, it ought still to find a place in the breast of princes." It has, however, been conjectured, that John's strongest motive for returning to England was a passion he had conceived for the countess of Salisbury, one of the most beautiful women of that age.

The French lost 20,000 men, and Pedro was reinstated in his dominions.

Those glorious exploits which we have related, produced in them no beneficial consequences to England; and the joy of the nation was miserably clouded by seeing the heroic Black Prince return to his country in the last stage of a mortal distemper. This most valiant and accomplished man, whose character had not a single blemish, died, to the unspeakable grief of the nation, in the forty-sixth year of his age. King Edward, who had beheld his decline with all the feelings of a parent for the worthiest of sons, withdrew himself upon his death from all the concerns of government, and died about a year after.

The reign of Edward III., which was of fifty-one years' duration, is on the whole, certainly, one of the most glorious in the annals of England; nor is it alone the splendour of his foreign victories which has contributed to render the memory of this king great and illustrious. His foreign wars, though most eminently successful, were neither founded in justice, nor productive of any substantial benefit to the nation. But England in his time enjoyed domestic tranquillity. His nobles were overawed by the spirit and valour of their sovereign, and his people attached to him on account of his acts of munificence and his salutary laws. It is judiciously remarked by Robertson, that "conquerors, though usually the bane of human kind, proved often, in those feudal times, the most indulgent of sovereigns. They stood most in need of supplies from their people, and not being aided by

compel them by force to submit to the necessary impositions, they were obliged to make them some compensation by equitable laws and popular concessions." Edward III. took no steps of moment without consulting his Parliament, and hence that assembly rose into greater consideration during his reign, and acquired a more regular authority than in any former times. Edward confirmed the Magna Charta above twenty times in the course of his reign, and this has been generally considered as a proof of his high regard for the liberties of his people. But it has been judiciously observed by Hume, that these concessions rather give room for a contrary presumption. "If (says he) the maxims of Edward's reign had not been in general somewhat arbitrary, and if the great charter had not been frequently violated, the parliament would never have applied for those frequent confirmations, which could add no force to a deed regularly observed, and which could serve no other purpose than to prevent the contrary precedents from turning into a rule and acquiring authority*."

The prince of Wales had left a son of eleven years of age, who succeeded to the throne of his

* The magnificent castle of Windsor was built by Edward III., and Hume justly remarks, that the method of conducting that work affords a criterion of the condition of the people in that age. Instead of engaging workmen by contract, or for stipulated wages, Edward assessed every county in England to send him a certain number of masons, tilers, and carpenters, as if he had been levying an army.—Ashmole's Hist. of the Garter, Salisbu.

grandfather, by the name of Richard II. Charles VI. some time after became king of France at the age of twelve, and both these minorities were unhappy for their countries. In England, the three uncles of the king, the dukes of Lancaster, York and Gloucester, ruled the kingdom with no good understanding between them, and consequently with much disturbance to the nation. Yet Richard himself, when he assumed the reins of government, gave some indications of a vigorous and a happy administration. But this fair prospect was of short continuance. Though a prince of some spirit, he was possessed of a very weak understanding, abandoned to his pleasures, and a slave to unworthy favourites. By their persuasion, and to gratify his revenge as well as his avarice, he confiscated, on a specious pretence of treason, the estate of his uncle, Henry of Lancaster, duke of Hereford, a prince of great resolution and ability, and, by descent from Henry III., of no remote pretensions to the throne of England. While the king was employed in quelling an insurrection in Ireland, Henry of Lancaster, who was in high favour with the people, found means to levy a very formidable army: he engaged the earl of Northumberland in his interest, and prevailed on York, then viceroy in the king's absence, to give him no opposition; while, as he pretended, all that he had in view was the recovery of his estate. Richard, on his return from Ireland, found Lancaster at the head of his troops, determined to wrest from him the possession of the crown; his numbers were inconsiderable, and diminished by

desertion to his rival. Resistance he saw was vain while the body of the people were his enemies. Lancaster told him he was a novice in the art of government, and that *he* would teach him how to rule the people of England; to which the submissive monarch is said to have replied, "Fair cousin, since it pleases you, it pleases us likewise." Richard, confined in the Tower, was accused of mal-administration, and condemned by Parliament, who solemnly deposed him from the throne; he was confined a prisoner in the castle of Pontefract, and afterwards privately assassinated*. The parliament conferred the crown

* [Such is the account generally given by English historians, who, though they differ as to the manner of his death, give no credit to the rumours which disquieted the mind of Henry IV., of the escape of Richard into Scotland; and the specific account given by the contemporary Scots historians to this effect, has been wholly discredited by English writers. Recent researches, however, confirm the narrative of Bowyer, that Richard II., escaped from Pontefract castle, was discovered in the Western Isles, was honourably treated by Robert III., and, after his death, by the Regent Albany, during a period of no less than eighteen years, and died in Stirling castle, 1419. A Dissertation annexed to the third volume of the History of Scotland, by Mr. Fraser Tytler, not only produces the most unexceptionable testimony to these facts from original documents, but gives the most probable grounds for believing, that Henry IV., notwithstanding the pains which he took to convince his subjects of the death of Richard, was not only well aware of his existence in Scotland, but deeply interested that he should be kept there; in fact, that Richard II. was an hostage in the hands of the ambitious and unnatural Albany, for the secure detention of his sovereign James I., in England; and James, in like manner, an hostage in the hands of Henry IV. and V. for the detention in Scotland of so dangerous a rival to the reigning monarch of England.—See Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. iii. —E. 1834.]

on Henry of Lancaster, by the title of Henry IV. Thus began the contest between the houses of York and Lancaster, which for several years after involved the kingdom in misery and bloodshed; yet, in the end, contributed to establish and fix the constitution of England.

CHAPTER XIII.

ENGLAND and FRANCE in the FIFTEENTH CENTURY:—England under Henry V.—France under Charles VI.—Battle of Agincourt—Henry V. acquires the Crown of France—Charles VII.—Maid of Orleans—France recovered from the English—The Eastern Empire invaded by the Turks—By the Tartars under Tamerlane—Scanderbeg—Turks under Mahomet the Great take Constantinople—Greek Empire extinguished—Constitution of Turkey—France about the end of the Fifteenth Century—Lewis II.—Charles VIII.—Italy.

A BRANCH of the house of York was yet alive in the heir of the family of Mortimer, a boy of seven years of age. Percy, earl of Northumberland, who had contributed to raise Henry of Lancaster to the crown, had met with some acts of injustice from him, which changed him from a friend into a most implacable enemy. He, with his son Henry Percy, surnamed Hotspur, together with Owen Glendower, a formidable chieftain of Wales, and a large party of the Scots, united their forces with the resolution to elevate Mortimer, as true heir, to the crown of England. Henry met the rebels and their allies at Shrewsbury. Northumberland was detained by sickness, but his place was well supplied by the intrepid Hotspur. He again found a formidable antagonist and rival in prowess in young Henry

of Monmouth, the son of the king, who was afterwards the great Henry V. The death of Hotspur, by an unknown hand, decided the fate of the day, and Henry was victorious. Northumberland, commiserated for his age and misfortunes, obtained his pardon. The kingdom regained for a while its quiet, till it was again embroiled by a confederacy, at the head of which was the archbishop of York. This was quelled by the death of its author, who was the first prelate who had been capitally punished in England.—This period has been distinguished as the dawn of the Reformation, and Wickliffe as its morning-star. The efforts of this eminent reformer and his followers to disseminate true religion, and thereby dispel the darkness of popery which prevailed extensively throughout the land, exposed them to many trying conflicts both with the ecclesiastical and secular authorities, and many of his zealous followers suffered an extreme degree of rigour. This reign saw, likewise, the first capital punishments in England on account of religious opinions. Henry died at the early age of forty-six, and left the throne to his gallant son, Henry V., who, in the humiliation of France, brought the kingdom of England to a very high pitch of glory.

The care which Charles V., surnamed the Wise, had taken to retrieve the misfortunes of France, was in a great measure the cause of the ruin of that monarchy. The duke of Anjou, one of the uncles of Charles VI., who governed as regent in the minority of his nephew, not satisfied with embezzling the treasures of the crown,

oppressed the people with the most intolerable exactions. Paris, and many other of the principal towns, rose openly in arms, and the king himself set out for Brittany, with the purpose of depriving their oppressor of his power and authority. At this critical period the young monarch was unfortunately seized with a deprivation of his intellects, which broke out in the most dreadful fits of madness. The ignorance of men in those days attributed this fatal, but natural calamity, to the effects of witchcraft. An Italian lady, the wife of his brother, the duke of Orleans, was accused as the author of his misfortunes, and the suspicion was increased by a very strange accident. In a masquerade at court the king appeared in the garb of a wild man, covered with leaves, which were stuck with pitch upon a close habit of linen, and he led in chains four other satyrs, dressed in the same manner. The duke of Orleans, who held a burning torch, approached accidentally too near these combustible knights; one of the habits took fire, and the four satyrs, who were four of the principal nobility, were burnt to death. The king escaped with life, but was seized with a dreadful fit of frenzy. To relieve him, they sent for a magician from Montpellier, and he became somewhat better. The fact was, his disease had lucid intervals, and in these he sometimes resumed the management of his kingdom—which was of the worst consequence to France, for no measure was ever pursued to an end or with stability. The duke of Burgundy, who hated Orleans, and wanted to secure to himself the whole authority

of the kingdom, caused this nobleman, his own nephew, to be assassinated. A party rose in favour of his children, to revenge themselves on Burgundy. The queen, who aimed likewise at the chief administration, had a party who espoused her interest. All France was in commotion, and Henry V. of England could not have chosen a more favourable opportunity for the execution of his ambitious designs.

On pretence of recovering the ancient patrimony of the crown of England, Henry made a descent on Normandy, with an army of 50,000 men. He took the town of Harfleur, and carried devastation into the country. A contagious distemper arrested his progress, and destroyed three-fourths of his army, and in this deplorable condition, with about 9000 effective troops, he was met by the Constable D'Albret, at the head of 60,000 men. In this situation a retreat was attempted by the English, but they were harassed by the enemy, and compelled to come to an engagement on the plain of Agincourt. On that day the English arms obtained a signal triumph. The French were so confident of success, that they made a proposal to the English about surrendering, and began to treat for the ransom of their prisoners. Henry observed in their immense army the remissness and relaxation which commonly attend a great superiority of numbers. He led on his little band to meet them in order of battle. The French stood for a considerable space of time, and beheld this feeble foe with indignation and contempt. "Come on, my friends," said Henry; "since they scorn

to attack us, it is ours to show them the example. Come on, and the blessed Trinity be our protection." The English archers, as usual, began the conflict. Their arrows were a yard in length, and falling as thick as hail upon the main body of the enemy, threw them into great confusion. After the first discharge, the archers seized the sword, and rushing on a body of horse, which were advanced beyond the line, dispersed and drove them back upon the ranks of infantry. A body of English cavalry, in the mean time, sprung from an ambush, and attacked one flank of the army, which was assailed by the foot on the other. Henry, dismounting from his horse, threw himself into the hottest of the engagement, and singly maintained for a while a combat against several French knights. He was felled to the ground, but owed his life to the intrepidity of a gallant Welshman, who despatched, with his own hand, several of his assailants. Recovering his senses, he was attacked by the duke of Alençon, who cleft with his sword a part of the king's helmet. Alençon, however, was killed in that attempt, and the French were broken, dispersed, and entirely cut to pieces. The number of the slain amounted to 10,000, and 14,000 were taken prisoners. The loss of the English in the victory of Agincourt is said not to have exceeded forty men—a fact bordering upon the incredible.

France was now in the most deplorable situation, but Henry was obliged to return to England for a supply both of men and money. He landed, however, soon after on the continent with an army of 25,000 men, and prepared to strike a

decisive blow for the crown of France. The duke of Orleans, as we have mentioned, had been assassinated by the duke of Burgundy. He, in his turn, fell by the treachery of the Dauphin, who was afterwards Charles VII. But his son, to revenge the death of his father, concluded a league at Arras with the monarch of England. With this assistance Henry proceeded in his conquests, was soon master of all Normandy, and advanced to Paris. The court, with their insane monarch, fled to the city of Troye, where Henry, still pursuing, forced on a treaty with the queen-mother and the duke of Burgundy, by which it was stipulated that he should marry Catherine, the daughter of Charles VI., and receive all France as her dowry. It was agreed that the insane monarch should retain, for life, the title of king, while Henry enjoyed the government, to which he was to succeed without dispute upon his death. Such was the tenor of a treaty very glorious for England, but too repugnant to the interests of both kingdoms to be of any long continuance.

In the mean time the Dauphin, aided by a body of 8000 Scots, took advantage of the king's return to England to vindicate his hereditary dominions, which had been thus conferred on a stranger by those who had no power to dispose of them. He attacked the English army under the duke of Clarence, and gained a complete victory; but the return of Henry changed the face of affairs, and all was submission to this victorious monarch. This, however, was the last term of his glories; an incurable disease attacked

his vitals, and he died in the thirty-fourth year of his age, one of the most heroic princes that ever swayed the sceptre of England. The duke of Bedford, brother of Henry V., was declared regent of France, and Henry VI., a child of nine months old, was proclaimed king at Paris and at London.

On this fact of the conquest of France by Henry V., Voltaire makes an observation which deserves attention, as developing the springs of popular opinion:—"If this revolution," says he, "like some others, had been of long duration, and the successors of Henry had maintained what he had won, and been at this day monarchs of France, where would have been the historian who would not have judged their title good? We should not then have been told by Mezerai, that the painful disease, and death of this prince, was a punishment of God inflicted for his usurpation. Would not the popes have ratified the authority of his successors by apostolic bulls? Would not the people have regarded them as the anointed of the Lord? Where then would have been the authority of this famous Salic law? A chimera for the court wits to exercise their raillery, and a text for the fawning sermons of the courtly preachers! What Frenchman would not have extolled to the skies the great Henry V., the avenger of assassination and the deliverer of France?"

Charles VII., a prince who deserved to inherit his father's throne, recovered it by slow degrees. He had to oppose him the duke of Bedford, who, as regent of France, was master of the

power and revenues of the kingdom ; and he had against him, likewise, the duke of Burgundy, who was become one of the most formidable princes of Europe. The national resources of the kingdom were so entirely exhausted, that the mark of silver, which in the age of Charlemagne had been valued at half a livre, was now valued at ninety livres. In this distressed situation of France, Charles, availing himself of the superstition of the age, projected an extraordinary scheme for the recovery of his kingdom, by feigning an interposition from Heaven in his favour. A gentleman, of the name of Baudricourt, saw a young servant maid at an inn in Lorraine, whom he immediately conceived to be a fit person for playing a very extraordinary part. She was taught her cue, and made to counterfeit a divine inspiration. They carried her before the king, where the answers that were put in her mouth, and the demeanour which she assumed, convinced every body that she was inspired. Orleans was, at this time, besieged by the English. Joan of Arc, this heroic maid, who had now assumed the dress of a man, undertook to relieve the town and compel the English to abandon the enterprise. She put herself at the head of the French troops, attacked, beat and dispersed the English, who believed her to be the devil himself, delivered Orleans, and placed the crown upon Charles's head in the church of Rheims. She proceeded for some time in this career of success, till she was at last taken prisoner at Compiegne. The regent Bedford, either in a fit of passion, or to satisfy the revenge

of the English, instead of respecting, as he ought to have done, this singular instance of intrepidity in one of her sex, was prompted to behave with meanness and cruelty. She was tried as a heretic and sorceress by an ecclesiastical tribunal, and condemned and burnt at Rouen *.

The arms of Charles gained more advantage by the death of this heroine than, perhaps, they had done by her life; for this piece of cruelty contributed to render the government of the English extremely odious. Charles was every day making some new conquest, though it cost him fifteen years before he made his entry into Paris, and almost as many more before the English were entirely driven out of France. They retained, in the end, nothing but the town of Calais, and lost all those domains which had belonged to the crown of England by inheritance. Such was the small fruit that remained of the glorious victories of Cressy, Poitiers, and Agincourt. Charles VII. governed his kingdom with great wisdom, and established a better political economy than any monarch of France since the days of Charlemagne.

While the situation of the West of Europe was such as we have described, the ancient and venerable empire of the East was in the last stage of

* This execrable deed was warranted by a solemn sentence of (Cauchon) the bishop of Beauvais, (Martin) the vicar-general of the Inquisition, nine doctors of the Sorbonne, and thirty-five other doctors in theology. Two of these inhuman doctors were afterwards condemned by Charles VII., and suffered the same punishment they had inflicted on this heroic woman.

existence. The Turks were daily acquiring strength in Asia Minor, and gradually encroaching upon the frontier of the empire of Constantinople.

Ottoman, the Turkish sultan, had fixed the seat of his empire at Byrsa, in Bithynia, and his son Orcan advanced to the borders of the Propontis. The Greek emperor, John Cantacuzenus, did not disdain to court an alliance with this prince, by giving him his daughter in marriage. The Turks, in the reign of his successor, John Paleologus, began to think of crossing over into Europe; and as the Genoese were then in possession of one of the suburbs of Constantinople, they agreed to give this people a large sum of money for the use of their ships to transport them across the Bosphorus. They passed accordingly, and besieged, took and garrisoned the city of Adrianople, within one hundred and fifty miles of Constantinople, a circumstance most justly alarming to the capital of the East. It was in this situation of affairs that the emperor, John Paleologus, made his application to the pope for relief—a measure sufficiently humiliating; but, on his return to Constantinople, his conduct was still meaner, for he concluded a treaty with the sultan Amurath, not like one crowned head with another, but as a slave with his master; and he gave him, as a hostage, his son Manuel, who actually served in the Turkish army against the Christians. Amurath was succeeded by Bajazet, surnamed the Thunderbolt, who brought the Greek empire to the lowest pitch of debasement. He ordered the emperor to de-

stroy the fortifications of Constantinople, and to admit a Turkish judge into the city to decide all causes between the Turks and Christians. At length he laid siege to it in form; and the capital of the Eastern Empire would have fallen at once in the hands of the Turks—had it not owed its preservation for a while to another race of barbarian invaders. Tamerlane, a prince of the Mongol Tartars, saved Constantinople by attacking Bajazet.

Timurbek, or Tamerlane, was a descendant of Gengiskhan; he was born in Sogdiana, which is now the country of the Usbecks, and was endowed with that enterprising genius, great courage and unbounded ambition, which distinguish all who have made extensive conquests. He had already subdued Persia, India, and Syria, when the enemies of Bajazet, Mussulmen and Christians, invited him into Asia Minor, as an heroic prince to whom they wished to be indebted for their deliverance. In compliance with this request, very flattering to his ambition, he sent an embassy to Bajazet, requiring him to raise the siege of Constantinople, and give up immediately all his conquests. This message, as may be believed, was treated with scorn and indignation, and Bajazet marched against him with an army whose numbers almost surpass credibility. He engaged him near Ancyra, in Phrygia; his army was cut to pieces; three hundred and forty thousand are said to have fallen in the field, and Bajazet became the prisoner of Tamerlane. It is vulgarly reported, that he inhumanly confined this unhappy monarch in an iron cage and trod

upon his back to mount his horse. But this prince, who was really an heroic character, was never guilty of such meanness and cruelty. The oriental historians affirm, with more truth, that he treated the captive prince with great clemency, and with respect suitable to the rank of which his misfortunes had deprived him.

Tamerlane made Samarcand the capital of his empire, and there received the homage of all the Asiatic princes, and even friendly embassies from several of the sovereigns of Europe. One circumstance, which strongly marks a greatness of character in this Tartar potentate, was his toleration. He believed himself neither in the sect of the Lama nor in the fate of Mahomet; but acknowledged one supreme Being, without any mixture of superstitious observances; yet he suffered all men, both Mussulmen and Idolaters, to exercise their own religious worship; and while he was passing Mount Libanus, he is said to have even assisted, with reverence, at the religious ceremonies of some of the Christian anchorets who dwelt on that mountain. Tamerlane had no learning himself, but he was careful to have his grandchildren instructed by the best preceptors he could procure; and such was the benefit of this example, that his successor, Olugbeg, founded at Samarcand an academy of sciencs, where astronomy, considering the barbarism of the times, was brought to a very considerable height. Samarcand is now fallen from the eminence which then distinguished it, and, in the possession of the Usbeck Tartars, has relapsed into its ancient state of barbarism.

The fate of Constantinople was thus retarded for a while by the victories of Tamerlane; but the Turks, after the death of that prince, resumed their schemes of destroying the empire of the East. The sultan, Amurath II., was a prince of a singular character. No man was more formed to increase the grandeur of his empire, and none was so fond of a life of quiet and retirement. He twice resigned the crown, and was twice prevailed on by his bashaws and janizaries to resume it. A most solemn treaty had been concluded, in the year 1444, between him and Ladislaus, king of Poland; and on the faith of this treaty, which gave peace to his dominions, Amurath had devoted his days to retirement and the study of philosophy, leaving the government in the hands of his son Mahomet. Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, the pope's legate, with the concurrence of his master, persuaded the king of Poland that is was necessary to break this treaty, which, being made with Mahometans, could not be binding on Christians, and Ladislaus accordingly invaded the Turkish territories; but he paid dear for his perfidy. The janizaries prevailed on Amurath to return from his solitude. He marched to battle at the head of his army, and taking the treaty with him in his bosom, solemnly invoked God, the avenger of injustice, to punish this violation of faith and outrage to the law of nations. The Christians were entirely defeated; the Mahometans triumphed. The king of Poland lost his life, and his head was carried in procession through the ranks of the Turkish army. To complete this signal ven-

geance, the author and adviser of this unjustifiable act, Cardinal Julian, was drowned as he crossed a river, borne down by the weight of an immense treasure, with which he was attempting to make his escape. Amurath retired once more from the cares of empire, and was once more prevailed on to resume his crown. He left his dominions to his son Mahomet II., who inherited his military, if not his philosophic talents; but his designs against the Greek empire, as well as his father's, were retarded, as those of Bajazet had been, by the necessity of defending their own territories against another very powerful invader: This was Scanderbeg.

Scanderbeg, whose real name was John Castriot, inherited from his father the country of Albania, a small part of the kingdom of Epirus. In his infancy, Amurath had seized on Albania, and taken possession of the person of Scanderbeg. He treated him, however, with great clemency, and even educated him as his own child. But this distinction did not satisfy the young Scanderbeg, who secretly determined to regain his independence, and recover his hereditary kingdom. Amurath had entrusted him with the command of a small army, for the purpose of an expedition into Servia; but he was no sooner at the head of these troops than he turned his arms against the sultan. By means of intelligence with his subjects of Albania,—by his military talents, his great activity, and the excellent discipline which he introduced, he was able, with a small army, to maintain his ground, and secure the independence of his native province against the whole united force of the Turkish empire.

The revolt of Scanderbeg retarded, but did not put a stop to, the designs against Constantinople. At this time the declining empire of the East was in reality divided between three capitals: one was Constantinople, another was Adrianople, which, about a century before, had been taken, as we have mentioned, by Amurath I., and the third was Trebizond, at the extremity of the Euxine Sea, which had been the retreat of the family of the Comneni. Constantinople was torn by religious factions, while Mahomet the Great, a youth only twenty-one years of age, son of the philosophic Amurath, formed the plan of extinguishing the empire of the Greeks, and making that illustrious city the capital of the Ottoman power. He laid siege to Constantinople in the year 1453, while the indolent Greeks, made a very feeble preparation for defiance, trusting to an immense barricade of strong chains, which blocked up the entry to the port, and prevented all access to the enemy's ships. The genius of Mahomet very soon overcame this obstacle. He laid a channel of smooth planks for the length of six miles, resembling the frames which are constructed for the launching of ships. In one night's time he drew eighty galleys out of the water upon these planks, and next morning to the utter astonishment of the besieged, and entire fleet descended at once into the bosom of their harbour.

The Christian princes of Europe beheld this attack upon the metropolis and bulwark of Christendom with great indifference; they were indeed too much occupied at home to give any indulgence to the spirit of crusading. The em-

peror, Frederic III., wanted both power and courage for such an enterprise; Poland was under a very bad government; France was slowly recovering from the miseries in which she was involved by the English; and England was torn by domestic dissensions. The Italian princes were at war with each other; and Spain was under a number of separate governments, one half Christian and the other Mahometan. The only succour which Europe lent to the unfortunate Greek empire was a few Genoese ships sent to their aid by the emperor Frederic of Germany. In this situation the city was soon reduced to the necessity of capitulating; but when the articles were in dispute, an imprudent renewal of hostilities, on the part of the Greeks, exposed them to all the fury of the conquerors, who entered the city sword in hand. Constantine, the emperor, was killed in the assault, and Mahomet immediately converted his palace into a seraglio, and the splendid church of Santa Sophia into a Mahometan mosque. Thus ended the empire of the East, in the year 1453, one thousand one hundred and twenty-three years from the building of Constantinople by Constantine the Great.

The Turks, in this important conquest, showed a spirit very opposite to that of barbarians. Most of the churches were preserved entire, and the public exercise of religion allowed as before to all the Christians. Mahomet permitted the conquered Greeks to choose their own patriarch, and even installed him himself by giving him the crosier and ring, and from that time to the

present the Turkish sultans have always elected the patriarch of Constantinople, who is called Œcumenical. The pope, indeed, chooses another, who is styled the Latin Patriarch; and these two pontiffs continue to the present time to be as violently at enmity with each other as ever were the Eastern and the Western churches. Mahomet likewise founded several colleges and schools for philosophy, medicine, and most of the liberal arts and sciences. He was himself an able scholar, skilled in the foreign languages, both European and Asiatic, and was so much a lover of the arts as to entice, by very liberal rewards, several of the greatest proficients in painting and sculpture to come from Italy and reside at Constantinople.

Mahomet the Great pursued his conquests, and soon made himself master of Greece. He likewise subdued Epirus, after the death of Scanderbeg, and began to meditate the conquest of Italy. The Venetian fleet opposed his progress in that country, and, attacking him in Greece, made themselves masters of the city of Athens. This, however, they were not able long to preserve. Their commerce was always their chief interest, and they were glad to enter into a treaty with the Turks, by which they purchased from them the liberty of trading into the Black Sea. The Greeks remained under the dominion of the grand signior in a state of oppression little short of slavery; they were suffered, however, to retain their religion and their laws. They were allowed, paying a small tribute, to carry on a little commerce, and cultivate their lands. The patriarch's

revenues must, at least, have been considerable, as he paid, at his installation, no less than 8000 ducats, one half to the exchequer of the grand signior, and the other to the officers of the Porte. The greatest subjection the Greeks have been under, was in the tribute of children. Every father has been compelled to give one of his sons to serve among the janizaries or in the seraglio, or to pay a sum for his ransom.

The constitution of the Turkish empire is supported by the absolute government of the prince, the extreme celerity with which his mandates are carried into execution, and the despotic authority which he is enabled to exercise in the disposal of the lives and fortunes of all his subjects. Should the sultan be confined to a degree of authority in any shape less absolute than what he enjoys, the constitution of the empire would fall to pieces. It has been even maintained by some authors, as a maxim of state in the Ottoman empire, that the sultan cannot abridge his own power, and that his oaths and promises are always revocable when in any shape restrictive of his authority. Yet the sultan himself swears to observe and to govern according to the law of Mahomet, which, though it touches both matters of religion and of government, the learned doctors among the Turks maintain to be only binding upon the emperor in the articles of the Mussulman faith. Yet by these same doctors the principle of the most implicit obedience to the sultan is held forth to subjects as a doctrine of religion, rather than a maxim of state.

The contexture of the Turkish government is such a fabric of slavery, that it is almost impossible that any subject of the empire should inherit a free or an ingenuous spirit. The grand signior himself is born of a slave of the seraglio. The viziers are often slaves by birth, and through the whole empire it is hard to find any that derive their origin from ingenuous parents. It is therefore no wonder that the Turks should inherit a disposition fitted for the rule of an absolute master. "Ita quosdam homines," says Grotius, after Aristotle, "novimus natura esse servos, et ita populi quidam eo sunt ingenio, ut regi quam regere norint rectius*."

It is a part of the policy of the empire, that a certain number of young men should be educated in the seraglio, out of whom the sultan chooses his principal officers. But what is a very extraordinary piece of policy, if we may believe Rycaut, it is necessary that these youths should be of Christian parents. The reason he assigns is, that being educated in a different religion they will hate the Christians; but this is a very lame solution of a very inconceivable fact. A better reason, supposing the fact a true one, is afterwards given, when he says, that the Christian slaves, strangers in the empire, will necessarily have fewer connexions or dependents on their interest, and be the better disposed to an absolute submission to the will of their master. One thing is certain, that it is a fundamental maxim of the Turkish polity, that the servants of the prince should be such as he can entirely command,

* "Thus some nations are slaves by nature, born to be governed, not to govern."

and can at any time destroy without danger to himself.

The prime vizier is the first officer of the empire. There are six others, who are called viziers of the bench, who sit as assessors with him in judgment in cases of law, of which he is judge in the last resort over the whole empire. These subordinate viziers, however, never dare to interfere, unless the grand vizier demands their opinion. The power of the grand vizier is absolute over all the subjects of the empire. In the disposal of lives he is limited only in two respects: he cannot take off the head of any of the beglerbegs, or the bashaws, without the imperial signature, nor can he punish any of the janizaries, or of the soldiery, but through the medium of their military commanders*.

Inferior in a civil capacity to the grand vizier are the beglerbegs, who command several provinces, and the bashaws who command one province. The dignity of these officers is merely personal: there is not such a thing in the Ottoman empire as an hereditary office or dignity; and it is esteemed a rule of excellent policy to make frequent changes in these offices. Removal, therefore, is often practised without cause of discontent: but as this arbitrary change might convert a friend into a dangerous enemy, there is most commonly a sufficient cause alleged for sending the degraded officer a bowstring along with the order for his dismission.

* [The order of the janizaries has been abolished of late years: and many see in that abolition a sure omen of the dissolution of the Turkish empire.—1834. E.]

The revenues of the grand signior consist chiefly in the product of the several countries subject to his dominion. A vast number of vessels arrive annually from Greece, Egypt, Natolia, and the coast of the Black Sea, which bring all sort of stores that are necessary for the seraglio, for the janizaries, or for the fleet. It appears, from the registers of the empire, that till the year 1683, the revenues of the grand signior's exchequer did not amount to two millions sterling, a sum quite inadequate to the expenditure of the Turkish government and the support of their armies. It is therefore customary for the bashaws, in each province, to have funds assigned them upon the province itself for the maintenance of their troops.

The patrimony of the sultan arises, in a great measure, from the confiscation of the estates of the viziers and bashaws; and when he has occasion to supply his privy purse, it costs him only the condemnation of one of these unfortunate grandees. On the whole, the revenues of the Turkish empire are very inconsiderable. But the absolute power of the sultan supplies that defect, and can execute very great projects at a small expense.

We now return westward, to take a view of the kingdom of France about the end of the fifteenth century.

France, towards the end of this century, began entirely to shake off the feudal government. The only two great fiefs remaining were Burgundy and Brittany. Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, was one of the richest and most powerful

princes in Europe; but his ambition was the cause of his downfal, the loss of his dominions, and their absolute annexation to the crown of France. His favourite object was the conquest of Switzerland and of Lorraine. The Swiss entirely routed him in two pitched battles in their own country, and when he sought to wreak his resentment on Lorraine, the same Swiss followed him thither, and defeated him in a third engagement, where he lost his life. Lewis XI., by the feudal law, took possession of his dominions of Burgundy, as a male fief; while the princess Mary, the duke's daughter, married Maximilian, son of the emperor Frederic III., who thus became sovereign of the Netherlands. This match laid the foundation for many wars between France and the empire.

Lewis XI. was a prince of a very inconsistent character. His reign was a complication of tyrannical acts, of murders, and assassinations, though at the same time of some wise ordinances with respect to the public police of France. The increase of his dominions by the acquisition of Burgundy, and of Provence, which was bequeathed to France by the count de la Marche, augmented greatly the power of the crown. The fiefs, as we have said, were now almost totally extinguished. The great nobles had long ago ruined their fortunes by the crusades. The people had emancipated themselves from their jurisdiction, and repaired for justice to the civil magistrates. The parliaments, which we have seen established upon a fixed plan by Philip the Fair, were now composed of lawyers, and acted agreeably to statutes and usages of the realm;

and the king, who possessed the authority of supreme legislator, was now endowed with a power of great extent.

It is to Lewis XI., who was a vicious, and unprincipled tyrant, that France owed the extension of her commerce; the establishment of posts through the kingdom, and the regular administration of justice.

The count de la Marche, in bequeathing Provence to Lewis XI., left him likewise the empty title, which he enjoyed himself, of king of the two Sicilies. Lewis was satisfied with the effective donation of Provence, and thought no more of the Sicilies; but his son, Charles VIII., who was a weak and an imprudent prince, was extremely ambitious of reigning in Italy; accordingly, in the beginning of his reign, he projected, very inconsiderately, the conquest of Naples, an enterprise which, though successful, was in the end fatal to the French: an enterprise remarkable too on this account, that it excited the first idea of that plan which has since been a part of the general policy of Europe, the preservation of a balance of power.

The picture of Italy at this juncture may be drawn in a few words. The papal dominions were not very extensive. The house of Gonzaga was in possession of Mantua, and the little sovereignties of Faenza, Imola, Rimini, Bologna, and Ravenna, had been all usurped from the Holy See during the residence of the popes at Avignon. Modena and Ferrara had likewise an independent sovereign; Piedmont was in possession of the dukes of Savoy; Pisa was subject to the Florentines; and Genoa to the duke of

Milan, who was then a very powerful prince. The house of Orleans had mainly attempted to make good their pretensions to the sovereignty of Milan. Francis Sforza, the bastard of a soldier of fortune, had deprived their ancestors of this fine territory, of which the Sforzas became now the hereditary princes. Ludovic Sforza, for his own ambitious ends, was at pains to persuade Charles VIII. to undertake the conquest of Naples.

Florence, at this time, was at a very high pitch of splendour. It had now for above a century been distinguished, no less for its commerce than for its cultivation of the liberal arts. Perhaps there never was a family which deserved better of mankind than that of the Medici. Cosmo de' Medici, who was born in the year 1389, lived as a private citizen of Florence, without courting rank or titles, though the wealth which he had acquired by commerce might have raised him to a level with the most powerful of the European princes. The use he made of his riches was to relieve the poor, to perform the most splendid acts of public munificence, to embellish and to refine his country, and to promote the cultivation of the sciences and fine arts, by inviting to Florence from every quarter men eminent for their learning and talents. He died distinguished by no diadems nor splendid epithets of honour, but known by that most honourable of human titles, *the Father of his Country*. His reputation, however, gained for his descendants the chief authority in Florence. The dignity of Gonfalonier, which properly signifies Standard-bearer, became to be the office of the highest authority

was enjoyed by his son and his grandsons; and Peter de' Medici, his great grandson, was in possession of the chief power at Florence, at the time of Charles VIII.'s expedition into Italy.

Charles set out for Italy without taking the proper precautions which the importance of the enterprise required. Roderico Borgia, who ascended the papal throne by the name of Alexander VI., a pontiff whose memory has been deservedly execrated by all historians, had, as well as Ludovico Sforza, the duke of Milan, invited Charles to undertake this expedition. Scarce, however, had he set foot in Italy, when they began to traverse his designs, and joined against him with Alphonso, king of Naples. Charles, incensed at his perfidy, marched immediately to Rome, and besieged the pope in the castle of St. Angelo. Alexander was at length forced to sue for an accommodation; and then the French monarch with great devotion kissed his holiness's feet, and served him with water to wash his hands. Charles now marched his army into the kingdom of Naples. Alphonso, with the most despicable cowardice, fled into Sicily, where he concealed himself in a convent; and his son Ferdinand retreated to the island of Ischia, after discharging the Neapolitans from their allegiance to his family. Charles was now master of Naples; he entered the city in triumph, took the titles of Emperor and Augustus, and after giving a few entertainments to exhibit his magnificence, and imposing some enormous taxes to exemplify his authority, this most impolitic prince returned to France five months after he had left it, thinking

his conquest sufficiently secured by leaving it to be defended by three or four thousand men, while almost all Europe had entered into a combination to deprive him of it. Alexander VI., the states of Venice and Milan, the emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand of Aragon, and Isabella of Castile, all joined in a league against Charles, and met him on his return to France with an army of 30,000 men, while he had only 8000. Fortune, or courage, for he was not deficient in this quality, gave him the advantage over this great superiority of numbers. He defeated the confederates, and secured his return into France. But he left in the duchy of Milan one half of his little army. Scarcely had he arrived at Turin, when he received a message from Pope Alexander, who commanded him to withdraw his troops from Italy, to yield his pretensions to the kingdom of Naples, and to come and give an account of his conduct at the tribunal of the holy pontiff on pain of excommunication. He chose rather to return to France. In short, the kingdom of Naples was lost in as short a time as it had been won. Gonsalvo of Cordova, a Spanish general, whom Ferdinand of Aragon had sent to the assistance of Frederic, who claimed the crown of Naples from affinity with the last prince, found it a very easy task to drive the French entirely out of Italy. Such had been the sudden and decisive effect of this great confederacy against Charles VIII., that the princes of Europe thence derived a most useful lesson, and from that period considered it as a general law of policy to be always united in a tacit league to prevent

the exorbitant increase of the power of any particular state or sovereign. Robertson, in his History of Charles V., asserts that the idea of the preservation of *a balance of power* in Europe has its date from this confederacy against Charles VIII.: and "from this era," says he, "we can trace the progress of that intercourse between nations which has linked the powers of Europe so closely together, and can discern the operations of that provident policy which, during peace, guards against remote and contingent dangers, and which in war has prevented rapid and destructive conquests." But in this instance the elegant historian certainly pays a higher compliment to modern policy than it deserves. The system in question is perhaps more generally understood by the moderns than it was by the ancients; but (as Hume has remarked) the idea of a balance of power is founded so much on common sense and obvious reasoning, that "it is impossible it could altogether have escaped antiquity, where we find in other particulars so many marks of deep penetration and discernment." Xenophon represents one great combination of powers as having directly arisen from a jealousy of the increasing strength of the Medes and Persians. Thucydides assigns a similar origin to the league which was formed against Athens, and which produced the Peloponnesian war. Demosthenes, on the same principle, alarmed the fears of all the Grecian republics, from the increasing power and inordinate ambition of Philip of Macedon. The Grecian history affords many more examples of the

same policy. One example only occurs in the Roman history where this maxim seems to have been understood and put in practice against this all-conquering people. It is that of Hiero, king of Syracuse, who, though in alliance with the Romans, sent assistance to the Carthaginians during the war of the auxiliaries. In the remarks of Polybius on that subject, we find the principle of a balance of power as ably explained as it could be by any modern politician. "He esteemed it necessary," says Polybius, "both in order to retain his dominions in Sicily and to preserve the Roman friendship, that Carthage should be safe, lest by its fall, the remaining power should be able, without opposition, to execute every purpose and undertaking. And here," continues that author, "he acted with great wisdom and prudence; for that is never on any account to be overlooked; nor ought such a force ever to be thrown into one hand, as to incapacitate the neighbouring states from defending their rights against it."—Polyb., lib. i., c. lxxxiii. The system of a balance of power is therefore not a policy of modern invention; although we must own that it had not a general influence on the politics of Europe till the above-mentioned period of the confederacy against Charles VIII. This prince died at the age of eight and twenty, and leaving no children, the duke of Orleans succeeded to the crown of France by the title of Lewis XII., and revived, as we shall afterwards see, his pretensions to the kingdom of Naples.

CHAPTER XIV.

SPAIN, FRANCE, ITALY, and BRITAIN, at the end of the Fifteenth and beginning of the Sixteenth Century—Ferdinand and Isabella—Extinction of the Moors in Spain—Lewis XII. of France invades Italy—Pope Alexander VI.—Julius II.—England—Henry VI.—Civil Wars of York and Lancaster—Margaret of Anjou—Edward IV.—Richard III.—Henry VII.—Union of York and Lancaster—Impostures of Simnel and Warbeck.

A VERY important revolution, which at this time took place in Spain, now demands our attention to that quarter. The assistance which Pedro the Cruel had received from the Black Prince was of transitory effect. On the departure of Edward, Pedro was again attacked by his enemies, and murdered by his bastard brother, Henry of Transtamarre, who thus secured for himself and his family the throne of Castile.

The voluptuousness of a court is no uncommon prelude to a revolution in the kingdom. Thus it happened under Henry IV. of Castile, a descendant of Henry of Transtamarre. The weakness and debauchery of this monarch incited a faction of his nobles, headed by the archbishop of Toledo, to take the government into their own hands. They accused their sovereign of impotency, and declared his daughter

Joanna, who was the heiress of the kingdom of Castile, an illegitimate child; she was disinherited, and sent out of the kingdom; while the Cortes, or the assembly of the States, obliged Henry to settle the inheritance on his sister, Isabella.

The next concern of the associated nobles was to procure for Isabella a proper husband. Her alliance was courted by several princes. Lewis XI. demanded her for his brother, and the king of Aragon for his son Ferdinand. The king of Portugal sought her himself in marriage. The archbishop of Toledo, who headed the conspiracy against Henry, privately brought about the marriage of Isabella to Ferdinand of Aragon. This procedure exasperated the impotent Henry, who determined to rouse himself from his lethargy, and to exert his utmost endeavours to restore his daughter Joanna to her right of inheritance. A civil war was the consequence, which embroiled the whole kingdom. At length, Henry thought it his best policy to affect, at least, to be reconciled to his sister and to her husband Ferdinand, who took care that no future rupture should occasion their title to be disputed. The sudden and painful death of Henry left little doubt that he had been taken off by poison. Alphonso, king of Portugal, took up arms in favour of his niece Joanna, whom he intended to marry; but, after a war of some years' continuance, this unfortunate princess thought it her wisest course to end those disturbances, which she saw were not to be attended with success, by retiring into a monastery.

A wise and vigorous, though a severe, administration characterised the beginning of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Spain was at this time in great disorder—the whole country was a prey to robbers and outlaws. Even the nobility lived by depredation, and defended themselves in their castles against every legal attempt to restrain their violence. The new monarchs of Castile and Aragon determined to repress these enormities. The castles of the piratical nobles were razed to the ground. The office of the Santa Hermandad, or Holy Brotherhood, was instituted for the detection and punishment of murders, thefts, and all atrocious crimes. But amidst these laudable cares, the abominable tribunal of the Inquisition was furnished with such an extent of powers, that, under the pretence of extirpating heresy and impiety, the whole kingdom became a scene of blood and horror. The fortunes and the lives of individuals were entirely at the mercy of the grand inquisitor and his associates. It was never allowed to a criminal to be confronted with his accuser, nor even to be informed of his crime; the sole method of trial was by exposing the unhappy wretch to the most extreme tortures, which either ended his life in agony, or forced a confession of his guilt, which was expiated by committing him to the flames. It is computed, that after the appointment of Torquemada, the inquisitor-general of Spain, there were 6000 persons burnt in the short space of four years.

The ambition of Ferdinand and Isabella was

not limited to the possession of Aragon and Castile; the kingdom of the Moors, of Granada, which was all that remained of the Mahometan dominions in Spain, was a very tempting object of enterprise. Granada was at this time rent by intestine divisions; the factions of the Zegris and the Abéncerrāges had reduced that unhappy kingdom to the lowest state of weakness. The romantic exploits of these contending factions are remembered to this day in many beautiful Moorish ballads, and are pompously described in a very extraordinary work, entitled *Historia de las Guerras Civiles de Granada*, a book which contains a curious and authentic picture of a very singular state of society. In the moorish kingdom of Granada were preserved the last remains of the genuine spirit of chivalry and romantic gallantry, a state of manners which in that work is very happily delineated.

Aboacen, king of Granada, was at this time at war with his nephew, Abo-Abdeli, who attempted to dethrone him. Ferdinand of Aragon supported Abo-Abdeli in order to weaken both parties; and no sooner was he in possession of the throne, by the death of Aboacen, than Ferdinand attacked his former ally with the united forces of Castile and Aragon. The war was tedious, and lasted several years. Isabella accompanied her husband in several of his military expeditions, and attended him when he laid siege to the city of Granada in 1491. After a blockade of eight months, the pusillanimous Abo-Abdeli, who has been called El Rey Chico, or the Little King, meanly capitulated, contrary

to the sentiments and urgent remonstrances of above 20,000 of the inhabitants, who offered to defend their native city to the last extremity. The treaty between Abo-Abdeli and Ferdinand secured to the Moors of Granada a small mountainous part of the kingdom, with the enjoyment of their laws and religion. The Moorish prince, execrated by his people, betook himself to this despicable retreat. He is said to have wept when he cast back his eyes to the beautiful plain and city of Granada. "You have reason," said his mother, "to weep like a *woman* for the loss of that kingdom, which you could not defend like a *man*." Thus ended the dominion of the Moors in Spain, about 800 years after its foundation.

Ferdinand, now master of Aragon, Castile, and Granada, from that time took the title of King of Spain. He wanted only Navarre, which, as we shall see, he soon afterwards invaded and took possession of. Immediately after the conquest of Granada, he expelled all the Jews from the kingdom—a most impolitic step, which deprived Spain of about 150,000 inhabitants. The greatest part of these took refuge in Portugal, and carried with them their arts, their industry, and their commerce; the rest sailed over into Africa, where they were still more inhumanly used than in Spain. The Moors of that country are said to have ripped open their bellies, in order to search for the gold which they were supposed to have concealed in their bowels.

We have already seen that the arms of Ferdi-

nand of Spain were successfully employed in driving the French out of Italy, after the fruitless conquest of Naples by Charles VIII. Lewis XII., his successor, was sensible of the necessity of having the pope in his interest when any claims were to be made good against the states of Italy. He courted Alexander VI. likewise, upon another account; he wished to procure a divorce from his wife, the daughter of Lewis XI., and to marry Anne of Brittany, the widow of Charles VIII. Cæsar Borgia, the natural son of Pope Alexander, was, like his father, a monster of wickedness. The palace of the popes was stained with murder, adultery, and incest. Alexander was desirous of securing for his son Borgia an independent sovereignty, and he sent him for that purpose as his ambassador into France to make a treaty with Lewis, on the ground of their mutual pretensions. It was stipulated that the king of France should be divorced from his wife, and have the pope's assistance in the invasion of Italy, provided Cæsar Borgia should receive, in return, the dukedom of Valentinois, with the king of Navarre's sister in marriage, and a pension from Lewis of 100,000 livres. Lewis, having put his kingdom in a state of defence, crossed the Alps, and in ten days made himself master of Milan and Genoa. After some unsuccessful struggles made by Ludovico Sforza to regain the dukedom of Milan, that prince was betrayed by the Swiss troops, whom he had hired to protect his dominions, and given up into the hands of the French, among whom he passed his days as a prisoner, though treated both with

humanity and respect. Lewis XII., afraid of Ferdinand of Spain, who had dispossessed his predecessor Charles of the kingdom of Naples, thought it his most advisable measure to compromise matters with the Spanish monarch, and they agreed to divide the Neapolitan dominions between them. Ferdinand had Apulia and Calabria, and Lewis all the rest. Pope Alexander made no scruples of conscience to give his apostolical sanction to this partition, which dispossessed an innocent monarch, his ancient vassal, of all his territories.

But the French were not destined to have any durable possessions in Italy. Ferdinand soon after agreed with Pope Alexander to deprive Lewis of his part of the spoils. Gonsalvo de Cordova, who had the distinguished epithet of El Gran Capitano, was commissioned by his master to extirpate the troops of Lewis, as he had done those of Charles VIII. The French, it is true, made a better defence. The duke de Nemours, a descendant of the great Clovis, and the illustrious Bayard, the *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*, maintained their right to Naples with great military skill, and vied with each other in romantic feats of personal prowess. But the contention was vain. The conduct of the GREAT Captain was superior to the valour of the French, and Lewis irrecoverably lost his share of the kingdom of Naples. It is worthy of notice, that in this war between the French and Spaniards in Italy, the art of blowing up mines by gunpowder was first practised by one of the Spanish generals.

Alexander VI., in the meantime, and his favourite son Cæsar Borgia, continued to practise every effort of ambitious villany to increase their power and accumulate wealth. The personal estate of the cardinals on their death devolved to the pope, and many an unhappy cardinal died suddenly during this pontificate. Borgia, by force of arms, made himself master of the territories of some of the richest of the Italian nobles. Four of them he invited to a friendly conference, under the most solemn protestations of amicable intentions, and he massacred two of them by ambuscade. Vitelli, one of these wretched victims, is said to have intreated Borgia, his murderer, to ask of the pope, his father, a plenary indulgence for him in the agonies of death. Such is the deplorable weakness of superstition that can attribute to the most abandoned of men, the power of pardoning all offences against the Deity *. Italy was at length delivered of this monster and his son. It is said they had prepared poisoned wine for the entertainment of some wealthy cardinals, and that the pope himself, and his son, drank by mistake of a bottle intended only for his guests. The pope suffered an agonising death, but Borgia escaped by having

* We understand from Burcard, that it was at this time an established custom for every new pope, immediately after his election, and as the first act of his apostolical function, to give a full absolution to all the cardinals of all the crimes they might thereafter commit of whatever nature and degree. Burcard was master of the ceremonies to the pope's chapel, from Sixtus IV. to Julius II.—Accounts and Extracts of MSS. in the King of France's Library.

himself sewed up in the belly of a mule. He survived, however, but a short time, and reaped no other fruits of his own and his father's accumulated crimes, but the universal abhorrence of mankind. Most of the towns he had seized threw off their allegiance, and Pope Julius II. stripped him entirely of his possessions. In fine, Gonsalvo of Cordova sent him prisoner into Spain, where he died in miserable obscurity. It is sufficient to expose the principles of Machiavel to observe, that he holds forth Cæsar Borgia as a perfect pattern to all princes who have the ambition of uncontrolled dominion, and wish to establish their power upon a solid foundation; as if that power was secure which is founded on terror, or that authority were an object of a wise man's ambition, which must be purchased at the expense of universal detestation.

Julius II., the successor of Alexander VI., was a pontiff of great political abilities, of a bold and ambitious character, and consummately skilled in the art of war. It was he who employed Michael Angelo to cast his statue in brass, and when the sculptor would have put a book in his hand, "No," said he, "give me a sword, I understand that better than a breviary." It was his principal aim to drive the French out of Italy; but he chose, in the first place, to make them subservient to his designs of stripping the Venetians of several extensive territories, which had belonged to the Holy See, and which they had laid hold of on the death of Alexander VI. and Cæsar Borgia. This ambitious republic

had acquired immense possessions; and most of the sovereigns of Europe had an interest in depriving her of them, to regain what had been their own property. Julius II. brought about for this purpose one of the most formidable combinations of the European potentates that had ever been known. The pope, the Emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand king of Spain, Lewis XII., the duke of Savoy, and the king of Hungary, held a conference by their ambassadors at Cambray, and determined the destruction of Venice, which they would certainly have accomplished, had the confederacy long subsisted. Lewis of France began the attack, and defeated the Venetian army in the battle of Agnadello. Each of the competitors seized a share of the spoils of the republic. The pope took possession of all Romagna. The emperor seized the province of Friuli, which has ever since continued in the possession of the house of Austria. The Spaniards took Calabria; and Pope Julius, now seeing Venice completely humbled, and having secured his own share, determined, if possible, to make himself master of the shares of all the rest. In this laudable view, he entered into a league with that very republic to whom he had been so severe an enemy, and, by the most dexterous policy, prevailed both on them and the Neapolitans, on the Swiss, and even on the English, to assist him in driving the French out of Italy. The enterprising pontiff headed his armies in person. At the siege of Mirandola, with a helmet and cuirass, and sword in hand, he was among the first who entered the breach. The

French, for awhile, kept their ground, from the signal heroism of their generals—the brave Chevalier Bayard, and Gaston de Foix, who won the famous battle of Ravenna at the expense of his own life; but their troops, from the parsimony of Lewis, were ill supplied; their mercenaries deserted, their generals showed their talents only in making fine retreats, and in the end they lost every foot of territory which they had possessed in Italy. The same Swiss who had sold Ludovico Sforza to the French, now assisted to re-establish his son Maximilian Sforza in the dukedom of Milan: and the same league which had been at first concerted against Venice was, by a strange vicissitude of fortune, directed against France, so as to prove in the end fatal to Lewis XII. While he was driven out of Italy by the pope, the Venetians, and the Swiss—Ferdinand, king of Spain, seized on Navarre, which has ever since been incorporated with the Spanish monarchy. He employed for this purpose the assistance of Henry VIII. of England, by inviting him to send troops into France for the recovery of Guienne, which troops the Spanish king artfully employed in subduing Navarre. Henry VIII. was thus made the dupe of Ferdinand's artful policy; but this monarch, who was then in the vigour of youth, was impatient to show the world that he had no occasion to recur to the aid of allies to humble the French. His successes in France we shall afterwards mention. It is sufficient here to observe, that Lewis XII. was glad to purchase a peace, to marry the sister of Henry VIII., the princess

Mary of England, and, instead of receiving a portion, to pay the sum of 100,000 crowns.

Lewis XII., whose want of success in his foreign enterprises may be attributed to his having for his competitors two such consummate politicians as Pope Julius II. and Ferdinand king of Spain, was, in many respects, an excellent prince. He imposed few and moderate taxes, and was peculiarly attentive to the administration of justice through all his provinces. It is much to his honour, that, by some exemplary severities, he repressed that overbearing and rapacious spirit of the soldiery which had subjected the peasants of France to much misery and oppression. He is a prince whose memory is, on these accounts, deservedly respected by his country.

In order to retain a connected idea of our great object, the affairs of Britain, we must now return to the reign of Henry VI., when under that infant monarch, and by the great political as well as military talents of his competitor Charles VII. of France, we saw the English lose, by degrees, all their possessions in that kingdom, of which, a few years before, the French had acknowledged the king of England to be sovereign by inheritance.

Henry VI. son showed himself to be a prince of the most contemptible abilities. In his minority, the jealousy and misunderstanding between his uncle the duke of Gloucester, regent of the kingdom, and the cardinal of Winchester, his great uncle, who had the care of the king's

person and education, embroiled every political measure, lost France, and filled the nation with faction and disorder. The cardinal, to strengthen his own interest and depress that of his rival, married this shadow of a king to a woman of the most accomplished and manly spirit that, perhaps, ever appeared—Margaret of Anjou, daughter of Regnier, the titular king of Naples and duke of Lorraine. She had the qualities of a heroine, but they were sometimes stained with a cruelty which knew no bounds in the persecution of her enemies. Gloucester had been averse to her marriage with the king, and her first step was to devote him to destruction. His wife was accused of treason, aggravated by sorcery; a crime which in those days found the readiest belief. A priest and an old woman, her pretended accomplices, were burnt in Smithfield, and the duchess herself was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. The duke of Gloucester was arrested soon after on an accusation of treason, and was next morning found dead in his bed. These outrageous proceedings produced the greatest disgust in the minds of the people against the queen and the cardinal of Winchester, and rendered the king's name, who was supposed at least to countenance these enormities, both odious and despicable. It was the time for a competitor to start forth, and to avail himself of this general disaffection to the prince on the throne. This competitor was Richard, duke of York, a descendant by the mother's side, from Lionel, who was one of the sons of Edward III., and elder brother to John of Gaunt, from whom the present monarch

was descended. Richard, therefore, stood plainly in right of succession before Henry. He bore for his ensign a White rose, while Henry bore a Red one; and this circumstance gave the name to the two factions which deluged England in blood. The weakness of Henry VI., and the unpopularity of the government, gave occasion to frequent commotions.

The duke of York secretly fomented these disturbances, and, pretending to espouse the cause of the people, wrote to the king, advising him to dismiss from his person and councils the most obnoxious of his ministers. The easy monarch made partial concessions; while the duke, who found his influence with the people daily increasing, determined to avail himself of his power, and raised an army of 10,000 men. His enterprises were seconded to his wish by the king's illness, who now became subject to periodical fits of madness; and being incapable of maintaining even the appearance of royalty, York was appointed lieutenant and protector of the kingdom. This was a fatal blow to the party which supported the interests of the house of Lancaster, and who were now removed from all dignities and offices. At length the king, as if awaking from his lethargy, or rather roused by the instigation of his spirited wife, was prevailed on to deprive the duke of York of his power, who had by this time annihilated the royal authority. In consequence of this step, York instantly had recourse to arms. Henry was dragged to the battle of St. Alban's, where the party of York gained a complete victory. The king was

wounded and taken prisoner, but treated by the victor with great respect and tenderness. He was soon after led in triumph to London; and the duke of York, permitting him still to enjoy the title of king, assumed to himself that of Protector, under which he exercised all the real powers of the sovereign.

Margaret of Anjou, whose courage rose from her misfortunes, prepared to avenge the cause of her husband, and to support the regal authority. With the assistance of those nobles who were devoted to the house of Lancaster, she raised a considerable army, and met the troops of York on the borders of Staffordshire. A desertion from that party increased so much the strength of the royal army, that their opponents instantly dispersed, and the duke fled into Ireland, while his cause was secretly maintained in England by Guy earl of Warwick, a man of great abilities, and of the most undaunted fortitude. By degrees, the activity of this nobleman collected an army sufficient to take the field. Margaret of Anjou had ranged her army at Northampton, determined to fight herself at the head of her troops, while the despicable king remained in his tent, awaiting in great perturbation the issue of the engagement. The royal army was overthrown, and Henry once more made a prisoner, and brought back to London. Margaret fled with precipitation to Wales, and, her manly spirit never deserting her, employed herself in levying a new army for the rescue of her husband, and the re-establishment of his authority.

Meantime a parliament was summoned at London, where the duke of York openly claimed the crown of England, as the representative of Edward III., to the exclusion of Henry VI., born of a younger branch. It was now for the first time that the House of Lords seemed to enjoy an unbiassed deliberative authority. The cause of Henry and of the duke of York was solemnly debated, each side producing their reasons without fear or controul. York, notwithstanding his successes, could not gain a complete victory in parliament. It was decided that Henry should continue to reign for life, and that the duke should succeed him, to the exclusion of the Prince of Wales.

Margaret, meantime, had levied an army of 20,000 men; and meeting the party of York near Wakefield, an engagement ensued, in which her arms were victorious. The duke of York himself was killed in the engagement, and his head, encircled with a paper crown, was, by the king's order, fixed upon the gates of the city of York. The earl of Warwick, however, kept alive the courage of the vanquished, and carried about the pitiful Henry as his prisoner. He met the army of the queen once more at St. Alban's, where the royal arms were again victorious. But when Margaret, who had now set her husband at liberty, prepared to enter London in triumph, she found the gates of the city shut against her. Young Edward, the eldest son of the late duke of York, had begun to repair the losses of his party. London had declared in his favour, and proclaimed him king, by the title of

Edward IV. Margaret of Anjou, whose greatness of soul was superior to all her misfortunes, retreated to the north of England, where she found means to assemble an army of 60,000 men. Warwick met her, at the head of 40,000, at Towton, on the borders of Yorkshire. An engagement ensued; one of the bloodiest and most desperate that is recorded in the English history. Thirty-six thousand men were left dead upon the field: Warwick gained a complete victory, by which the young Edward was fixed upon the throne, and the vanquished Margaret, with her husband and infant son, took refuge in Flanders.

Here she did not long remain. With what slender assistance she could procure on the continent, she landed again in England: again defeated, she fled over to France to her father, Regnier of Anjou, who could afford her nothing but a retreat. Henry was once more made a prisoner and confined in the Tower of London. Edward IV., now crowned by the hands of Warwick, became ungrateful to his benefactor. The earl had negociated a match between the young monarch and the princess Bona of Savoy, the sister of Lewis XI. of France. When the marriage was on the point of conclusion, Edward chanced to fall in love with one of his own subjects, the widow of Sir John Grey, and privately married her; Warwick was justly incensed, and expressing strongly his resentment of the affront, the young king, equally ungrateful and impolitic, banished him from the council, and thus made him his irreconcilable enemy. It was not long

before Warwick found an opportunity of revenge. His daughter was married to the duke of Clarence, the king's brother. This prince he seduced from his allegiance, as well as many of the nobles of the York faction, and Warwick now openly stood forth the champion of the house of Lancaster. After various intermediate changes, Edward was deposed from the throne, and Henry VI. once more reinstated by the hands of Warwick, who was now distinguished by the epithet of the *King-maker*. Edward, banished for awhile to the continent, returned to England. The city of London were his friends, and a powerful party in the kingdom espoused his interest. An engagement followed at Barnet, where the party of York was again victorious; and Margaret of Anjou, returning at that time with her son from France, received the dispiriting intelligence that her army was defeated, and her new champion, the brave earl of Warwick, slain in the engagement.

This most intrepid and matchless woman continued with unshaken firmness of mind to struggle against adversity, and once more prepared to strike a decisive blow for the crown of England. This was at Tewkesbury, where she commanded her army in person, and led her son the prince of Wales through the ranks. But all was in vain: victory declared in favour of Edward, and the unhappy mother, separated from her son, was sent a prisoner to the Tower of London. The prince of Wales, a youth of intrepid spirit, being brought into the presence of Edward, and

asked, in an insulting manner, how he dared to invade the territories of his sovereign, "I have entered," said he, "the dominions of *my father*, to revenge *his* injuries and redress *my own*." The barbarous Edward is said to have struck him in the face with his gauntlet, while the dukes of Gloucester and Clarence, and others of the attendants, rushed upon the noble youth and stabbed him to the heart with their daggers. The death of Henry was next resolved, and the duke of Gloucester, in the true spirit of butchery, is said to have entered his chamber, and massacred the feeble monarch in cold blood*. Margaret they allowed to live, in hopes of her being ransomed by the king of France; and that monarch in effect paid 50,000 crowns for her freedom. She died a few years afterwards in France—a woman whom, but for some instances of cruelty in the beginning of her career, all Europe must have venerated and admired.

Edward IV., now firmly seated on the throne,

* It is but justice to observe, that this atrocious fact has been altogether doubted. The historians of the times, being under the influence of the house of Lancaster, are to be read with much caution; and nothing after all is given as evidence of this fact but common fame. Those writers all fix the time of Henry VI.'s death, to the 21st of May, 1471. Guthrie, however, has produced from the records undoubted evidence that he was alive on the 12th of June thereafter; and some historians, even of the Lancaster party, affirm that it was reported at the time that he died of anguish and grief of mind. It is certain that his body was conveyed to St. Paul's and there exposed to public view, a circumstance which ill agrees with the idea of a private murder.—See Guthrie's History of England, vol. ii. p. 719, 720

abandoned himself to vicious pleasures. His life was passed in a succession of riots and debauchery, and acts of tyranny and cruelty. His brother the duke of Clarence, taking the part of a friend who had fallen a victim to the king's displeasure, and inveighing severely against the rigour of his sentence, was on that account alone arraigned and condemned to suffer death. The only favour shown him was to choose the manner of it, and he very whimsically chose to be drowned in a butt of Malmsey. A war was proclaimed against France, but during the preparation for this enterprise, which was highly grateful to the nation, an event no less grateful happened, which was the death of Edward IV., at the age of forty-two, poisoned, as is supposed, by his brother Richard, duke of Gloucester. He left two sons, the eldest Edward V., a boy of thirteen years of age. Gloucester, named Protector of the kingdom, gave orders that the two princes for security should be lodged in the Tower. Hastings, a friend to the royal family and an enemy to tyranny, had too strongly expressed his concern for their safety, and attachment to their interest. Richard, on a most frivolous pretence of treason, ordered this nobleman to be arrested in the council, and he was instantly led forth to execution. The duke of Buckingham, the slavish instrument of an ambitious tyrant, had wrought upon a mob of the meanest of the populace to declare that they wished Richard, duke of Gloucester, to accept of the crown; this was interpreted to be the voice of the nation. The crafty tyrant, with affected scruples and with much appearance of humility, was at length prevailed on to yield to their desires and to

accept the proffered crown. His elevation had been purchased by a series of crimes, and was now to be secured by an act of accumulated horror. Three assassins, by the command of Richard, entered at midnight the apartment of the Tower where the princes lay asleep, and, smothering them in the bed-clothes, buried them in a corner of the building.

At length, after a reign of two tedious years, an avenger of these atrocious crimes appeared in the person of Henry, earl of Richmond, a prince of the lineage of John of Gaunt. Henry was yet very young when he formed the design of dethroning Richard, and of reclaiming England as the patrimony of the house of Lancaster. His first attempt was unsuccessful; and after his party had been twice defeated, he was obliged to return for shelter to Brittany. Thence he was forced by the treachery of the duke of Brittany's minister, who had privately covenanted to deliver him up to Richard. Betaking himself to the province of Anjou, he was aided by Charles VIII. of France, with a small army of 2000 men. With this slender support he landed in England. The Welsh flocked to his standard, and, animated with courage, he ventured to give battle to Richard on the field of Bosworth. Richard III. met him with an army double his numbers; and the event would probably have been unfortunate for Richmond, had not Lord Stanley, with a large body of troops, changed sides in the heat of the engagement, and fought against the usurper. This decided the fate of the day; the army of Richard was entirely defeated, and the tyrant himself met with a better death

than his crimes and cruelties deserved. Seeing that all was lost, he rushed with desperate fury into the thickest of the enemy, and fell pierced with innumerable wounds. The crown which he wore on his head during the engagement was immediately placed upon the head of the conqueror.

The army of Richmond sang a hymn to God upon the field of battle, and, with the loudest acclamations, proclaimed him as Henry VII. king of England. This auspicious day put an end to the civil wars between the houses of York and Lancaster. Henry, by marrying the princess Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., united in his own person the interests and rights of both these families. This excellent prince, who knew how to govern as well as to conquer, was one of the best monarchs that ever reigned in England. The nation, under his wise and politic administration, soon recovered the wounds she had sustained in those unhappy contests. The parliaments which he assembled made the most salutary laws, the people paid their taxes without reluctance, the nobles were kept in due subordination, and that spirit of commercial industry for which the English have been, in these latter ages, justly distinguished, began to make vigorous advances under the reign of Henry VII. The only failing of this prince was an economy, perhaps too rigid, which in his latter years degenerated even into avarice; and though his taxes were not oppressive, he left in the treasury, at his death, no less than two millions sterling; a certain proof of two things—the one that it is possible, without oppressing the

people, for all the emergencies of government to be most amply supplied; the other, that the prince's economy can effectually check that dissipation of the public money by corrupt and rapacious officers, which increases both the weakness of the state and the grievances of the people.

The reign of Henry VII. was disturbed for a while by two very singular enterprises. The earl of Warwick, son of the late duke of Clarence, had been confined by Richard in the Tower, and by his long imprisonment was totally unknown, and unacquainted with the world. One Simon, a priest of Oxford, trained up a young man, Lambert Simnel, the son of a baker, to counterfeit the earl of Warwick's person, and instructed him in the knowledge of all the facts which were necessary to support the imposture. He first made his public appearance in Dublin, where he found many to espouse his cause, and he was there solemnly crowned king of England and Ireland. Thence passing over to England, he ventured to give battle to Henry near Nottingham. Simnel with his tutor, the priest, were both taken prisoners. The priest, who could not be tried by the civil power, was imprisoned for life; and the impostor himself, who was too mean an object for the revenge of Henry, was employed by him as a scullion in his kitchen.

This enterprise was succeeded by another, which was not so easily defeated. The old duchess of Burgundy, sister of Edward IV., and widow of Charles the Bold, who wished by all means to embroil the government of Henry, caused a report to be spread that the young duke

of York, who, along with his brother Edward, was hitherto believed to have been smothered in the Tower by Richard III., was still alive—and she soon after produced a young man who assumed his name and character; this was Perkin Warbeck, the son of a Jew broker of Antwerp, a youth of great personal beauty and insinuating address. He found means, for a considerable time, to carry on the deception, and seemed, from his valour and abilities, to be not undeserving of the rank which he assumed. For five years he supported his cause by force of arms, and was aided by a respectable proportion of the English nobility. James IV., king of Scotland, espoused his interest, and gave him in marriage a relation of his own, a daughter of the earl of Huntley. After various changes of fortune, during all which Perkin showed himself to be a man of genius and intrepidity, he was at length abandoned by his followers on the approach of the royal army, which greatly exceeded them in numbers, and forced to deliver himself up to Henry's mercy, who only condemned him to perpetual imprisonment. This, however, was too much for his impatient spirit. He attempted to make his escape, and secretly tampered with the unfortunate Warwick, still a prisoner in the Tower, to raise a new insurrection; the consequence was, that Perkin Warbeck was hanged at Tyburn, and young Warwick, tried by his peers, condemned and beheaded on Tower-hill.

It is necessary to remark, that the real character and pretensions of Perkin Warbeck are, to this day, a subject of uncertainty and of controversy; and upon an examination of the evidence

on both sides of the question, there are many now, as there were then, who believe that this young man was, in reality, the son of King Edward IV. Carte, in his History of England, was, I believe, the first who ventured to suggest his doubts with regard to the common notion of Warbeck's being an impostor, and other reasons have since been added by Guthrie, which strongly countenance the supposition that this young man was really the duke of York. Horace Walpole, in his Historic Doubts on the Reign of Richard III., has taken up the same side of the question, as if it had been a new idea started by himself, though the authors I have mentioned have furnished him with the best part of his arguments.

CHAPTER XV.

SCOTLAND from the middle of the Fourteenth Century to the end of the Reign of James V.—David II.—Robert II., first of the House of Stuart—Robert III.—James I., II., III., and IV.—Marriage of James IV. with Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., founds the hereditary title of the House of Stuart to the Throne of England—Battle of Flodden—James V.—Ancient Constitution of the Scottish Government.

THE feudal aristocracy had attained to a great degree of strength in Scotland in the time of Robert Bruce. In return for the services of the nobles in placing him upon the throne, Robert bestowed on them large grants of the lands of which they had dispossessed the English. Property before this time had been subject to great revolutions in Scotland. Edward I., having forfeited the estates of many of the Scottish barons, granted them to his English subjects. These were expelled by the Scots, who seized their lands. Amidst such frequent changes, many held their possessions by titles extremely defective, and Robert formed on this ground a scheme for checking the growing power and wealth of his nobles. He summoned them to appear, and show by what rights they held their lands. "By this right," said each of them, laying his hand

upon his sword; "by the sword we gained them, and by that we will defend them." Robert, apprehensive of the consequences of exasperating this resolute spirit of his nobles, wisely dropped his scheme.

Robert Bruce had a son, David, and a daughter, Margery. In a parliament, which he held at Ayr, in the year 1315, before the birth of his son David, he had solemnly settled the succession to the crown of Scotland, failing heirs of himself, upon his brother, Edward Bruce, and his male issue; on failure of whom, upon his daughter Margery and her heirs. Margery was afterwards married, in her father's lifetime, to Walter, the high steward of Scotland, of which marriage sprang Robert, the first of the house of Stuart who sat upon the Scottish throne, and who succeeded in virtue of this settlement of the crown made by his grandfather Robert Bruce.

Robert Bruce died in the year 1329, and was succeeded by his son David Bruce, then an infant. Taking advantage of this minority, Edward Baliol, the son of John, formerly king of Scotland, urged his pretensions to the crown; and, secretly assisted by Edward III. of England, entered the kingdom at the head of an army. He found a considerable number of partisans among the factious barons, and so great, for awhile, was his success, that he was crowned king at Scone, while the young David was conveyed to France, where he received an honourable protection. But matters did not long remain in this situation. The meanness of Edward Baliol, who was contented to acknowledge

the sovereignty of Edward III. over his kingdom, deprived him of the affections of the nation. Randolph, earl of Murray, Robert, the steward of Scotland, and Sir William Douglas, roused the Bruce's partisans to arms, and, with the assistance of Philip of Valois, king of France, David was restored to his kingdom; but it was only to experience a new reverse of fortune. In an invasion of the English territory, the Scots were opposed by a powerful army, which was led into the field by the high-spirited Philippa, the queen of Edward III. The English gained a complete victory at the battle of Durham, and David, as we have formerly seen, was taken prisoner, and conveyed to the Tower of London. It was, soon after, his fortune to find a brother monarch in the same situation, John, king of France, the son of Philip of Valois, whom we have seen taken prisoner by the Black Prince, at the famous battle of Poictiers, and conducted in triumph to London. In this state of captivity David remained for eleven years, when, in consequence of a treaty of amity between the kingdoms, and a large ransom paid by the Scots, their monarch was again restored to his throne. During a reign thus perplexed, whatever had been the inclinations of the sovereign, it is impossible that his kingdom could have derived much benefit from his administration. David died in the year 1370, and leaving no issue the crown, according to the destination of his father Robert, went to the son of his sister Margery, who was Robert, the *high steward* of Scotland.

The reign of this first prince of the house of

Stuart exhibits no events which are worthy of commemoration. It passed in a series of unimportant skirmishes and inroads between the Scots and English, the most memorable of which was that which gave occasion to the heroic ballad of "Chevy Chace." But these incursions produced no effect of consequence upon either kingdom. The great barons were, however, gradually increasing their power; and under the reign of the succeeding prince, Robert III., their contests embroiled the nation in perpetual disturbances and outrages, which the weak and easy disposition of the sovereign was utterly incapable to compose or redress. He delegated the reins of government into the hands of his brother, the duke of Albany, —a measure which gave birth to the most flagitious designs in the bosom of the regent. Robert had two sons—the elder, whom he created duke of Rothsay; and the younger, James, who succeeded him in the throne of Scotland. The regent, Albany, found means to render the conduct of his nephew Rothsay, a young man of spirit and promising talents*, so suspected by his father, that he was confined in the castle of Falkland, where Albany starved him to death. The king, too weak to punish a man to whom he had committed the sole administration of the kingdom, sought only now how to preserve his sole surviving child, James, from a similar fate, which there

* The character of David, duke of Rothsay, is said to have borne a great similarity to that of his contemporary and rival, young Harry of Monmouth, the son of Henry IV., and afterwards the great Henry V.

was every reason to expect from the designs of his unnatural uncle. With the intention of conveying him to France, Robert put his son James on board of a vessel, which, unfortunately, was captured on her voyage by an English ship. The prince was brought a prisoner to London, and his father, whose spirit was quite unequal to so severe a misfortune, sunk into a melancholy despondency, and died about a year after.

James I. was, in the year 1405, declared king of Scotland, by an assembly of the states, which, at the same time, continued the duke of Albany in the regency till the prince should be released from his captivity. This was an event which the English were not willing to hasten, and which the duke of Albany was at no pains to procure. James remained a prisoner for eighteen years, during the reigns of Henry IV., V., and VI. He was treated with great honour and respect, and these monarchs made the best amends for their injustice in detaining him a captive, by the care which they bestowed on his education. He was endowed by nature with excellent talents, and he had at the English court opportunities of improvement which he must have wanted at his own. He learned there those maxims of government, which, to the great benefit of his country (though, in the end, to his own disadvantage), he reduced into practice when he regained his throne*.

* During the regency of Albany, and in the year 1410, the University of St. Andrew's was founded by Henry Wardlaw bishop of that see.

At the return of James into Scotland, he found his kingdom plunged in all the disorders and miseries of anarchy. The authority of a sovereign could never be effectually exercised by regents; who, to secure themselves in power, were obliged to pay court to the greater nobility, and countenance them in, or at least overlook, all their usurpations; and hence the kingdom was a scene of perpetual contests between the great lords, and of rapine and injustice among all ranks of the state. James determined to repress these enormities, and he began by the gentler methods of statutory enactments. He gained the affections and the confidence of his people by many excellent laws tending to establish order, tranquillity, and the equal administration of justice. He then prepared to undermine the power of his nobles, by a very equitable requisition, that those who possessed crown lands should exhibit the titles by which they held them. He next prohibited, with the utmost severity, all leagues and combinations among the nobility; and, as offending against this statute, he seized, during the sitting of parliament, on his cousin the duke of Albany, son of the regent, with two of his sons, and above twenty of the first rank of the nobility. Albany and his sons, with the earl of Lennox, were beheaded:—the rest he pardoned, and received again into favour. An example of this kind struck awe and terror into the whole order of the nobles.

James was adored by his people, who enjoyed unusual happiness and security under his admi-

nistration: but the nobles, who daily felt some new diminution of their power, were not long disposed to brook these innovations with submission. The earl of March, whose estates had been forfeited for rebellion against Robert III., the father of James, had been restored to his possessions and honours by the regent Albany. James, on pretence that this restitution was unjust, and beyond the powers of the regent, procured a sentence of parliament declaring this decree void, and again depriving the earl of his estate and honours. Many of the nobility, who held land by grants from the regent, suspecting that this was a prelude to a similar deprivation, began secretly to take measures for their mutual security. The earl of Athol, the king's uncle, who aspired to the crown, and who was next heir after James and his issue, together with a few desperate men, the friends and followers of those who had been the chief sufferers under the king's administration, formed a conspiracy against his life. He received intelligence of their designs, but his natural intrepidity treated the danger with contempt; and while in the Dominican convent near Perth, attended by his queen and a very few of the courtiers, he was murdered in the most cruel manner, in the forty-fourth year of his age, and thirteenth of his reign*. All historians allow to James the character of a

* A full detail of this most horrible murder is given by Pinkerton, Hist. of Scot. vol. i. from an old chronicle, translated from the Latin by J. Shirley, printed in the Appendix. This chronicle is a singular curiosity. Its date is about 1440.

wise, most accomplished, and excellent prince. No sovereign ever more happily united the utmost attention to the cares of government with elegance of taste, and a love of literature and the arts. In his youth he had successfully cultivated the sciences of poetry and music, and his poetical compositions remaining at this day may well vie with those of the English bards, his contemporaries, Chaucer and Gower. It was his misfortune, that his maxims and manners were too refined for the age in which he lived, and the nation which he governed. Buchanan, in his character of this accomplished prince, has indulged a vein of the most eloquent panegyric. "Tanta ingenii celeritas et vigor in eo fuisse dicitur, ut nullam homine ingenuo dignam artem ignoraverat:" and the same author, animadverting upon what some men had, during the lifetime of James, judged to be too rigorous an authority in the sovereign, he concludes with this reflection: "Mors vero ejus declaravit nihil justitia esse popularius: nam qui vivo detractare soliti erant, mortuum flagrantissimo desiderio sunt prosecuti."

James II., an infant of seven years of age, succeeded to the throne of Scotland in the year 1437. In his youth, under the direction of the Chancellor Crichton, a man of great abilities, who had stood high in the confidence of his father, sensible of the power and insolence of the nobles, he pursued the same maxims of government, which an impetuous temper, in some instances, prompted him to carry to a blameable as

well as a dangerous excess. The earl of Douglas, an ambitious and high-spirited nobleman, had openly aimed at rendering himself independent of his sovereign: he forbade his vassals to acknowledge any authority but his own. He created knights, appointed a privy council, and, in short, assumed every ensign of royalty except the title of king. The chancellor, determined to suppress these aspiring pretensions, decoyed Douglas to an interview in the Castle of Edinburgh, and there, while separated from his followers, he was seized and instantly beheaded. This example of barbarous rigour did not deter his successor William, earl of Douglas, from prosecuting the same ambitious plans; and his fate was equally severe, and yet more unjustifiable. In a conference with the young monarch, he was reproached by him with forming connexions with the factious nobility which were dangerous to the public peace and government of the kingdom: the king requesting him to dissolve these associations, Douglas peremptorily refused. "If you will not," said the young James, "this shall:" and drawing his dagger, he instantly stabbed him to the heart. This action, unworthy of a prince, was universally condemned by his subjects, and nothing but the intemperate ardour of youth could ever palliate it. The vassals of the earl assembled immediately in arms, and were joined by a great body of the people. A rebellion arose which threatened the most dangerous consequences: but the succeeding earl of Douglas, if he possessed sufficient spirit, wanted at least the policy

to take advantage of those circumstances which, improved by a man of abilities, might have overturned the government. On the eve of an engagement which must have decided the fate either of the royal party or its ambitious opponents, Douglas imprudently disgusted some of his chief partisans, who, in revenge, immediately joined the banners of their sovereign. Dispirited by this secession, Douglas lost all courage, and disbanding the remainder of his army left the kingdom, while the vigour and talents of the monarch soon reduced all into order and subjection. James, who now reigned with absolute authority, did not abuse his power. He applied himself to the civilisation of his kingdom, and its improvement by the enactment of many excellent laws, but of which the great scope was the undermining the power of the nobility; a purpose, it must be acknowledged, extremely promotive of the security and happiness of the people, though it threw the whole power, with very little limitation, into the hands of the sovereign. The truth is, if an absolute government is at any time to be desired, it is in the case of a rude and uncultivated people. Towards a general and speedy civilisation, no form of government is equally effectual. It is only when men have arrived at that degree of refinement and cultivation as to be able to think wisely for themselves, and to see their *own particular* good in the *welfare of the community*, that a mixed government, justly attempered between the prince and people, is capable of retaining the latter in the line of their duty. The prose-

cution of these plans for the subversion of the feudal aristocracy was interrupted by the sudden death of James, who was killed by the bursting of a cannon at the siege of Roxburgh, in the thirtieth year of his age.

His son and successor, James III., possessed the same inclination to humble the power of his nobles, but he wanted the abilities of his father and grandfather. He expressed his hatred of his grandees by removing them from his councils, while he lavished his favour and confidence on a few mean persons, who had nothing to recommend them but their skill in some of the arts and sciences which the king himself understood and cultivated. He pursued, at the same time, the plan of his predecessors, by recalling all rights to the crown-land, which had been granted during his minority, and thus, without the support which they had in the affections of their people, he procured to himself the enmity and resentment of his nobles. It was the peculiar misfortune of this prince, that to his own family he owed his greatest distresses and calamities. His brothers, the duke of Albany and the earl of Mar, joined a confederacy of the nobles to deprive him of the throne. Albany concluded a treaty with Edward IV., in which he assumed the title of king of Scotland, and obliged himself, in return for a promise of aid from England, to do homage, and acknowledge Scotland to be dependent on the English crown. He obtained, accordingly, the assistance of a powerful army from Edward; and James, justly afraid of this formidable invasion, was

obliged to solicit the aid of those nobles whom he had so long treated with scorn and exasperated by injuries. They repaired indeed to the standard of their prince, but it was with a resolution to revenge their own wrongs instead of his. While encamped at Lauder, several of the chief nobility rushed into the king's apartment, in which he sat surrounded with his despicable favourites; dragged them out, in spite of the remonstrances and entreaties of their sovereign; and, without any form of trial, seven of them were instantly hanged over a bridge.

The rebellious Albany continued his machinations, which, however, were finally disappointed in their aim by the death of Edward. James III. might now have recovered the affections of his subjects, had he been capable of deriving improvement from experience: but persevering in his attachment to mean favourites, and in his enmity to his nobles, the breach was daily widening between them and their sovereign. At length, openly taking arms, they persuaded or obliged the duke of Rothsay, the king's eldest son, a youth of fifteen, to set himself at their head, and countenance their design of depriving his father of the reins of government. The king took the field, and encountered the rebel army near Bannockburn, the same place where the valiant Bruce so signally defeated the English army under Edward II. The event of the battle was fatal to James: his army was entirely routed, and he himself slain in the pursuit. He fell in the thirty-fifth year of his age, and was succeeded in the throne of Scotland by his son, James IV.,

then in arms against him; a circumstance which, after the father's death, struck the young sovereign with infinite remorse. He never forgave himself the offence, and wore, during the whole course of his life, an iron chain around his body as a continual penance.

It is worthy of observation, that in this reign of James III. we find the first traces of the English policy of securing an interest in the kingdom of Scotland by means of pecuniary supplies. The English felt severely the weight which Scotland gave by her co-operation to all the designs of France. To counteract this policy, a treaty was entered into for the marriage of James's eldest son (then a boy two years of age) with Cecilia, the youngest daughter of Edward IV., then in the fourth year of her age; and though the marriage was not to be celebrated till a distant period, it was agreed that the princess's portion should begin to be paid immediately, by annual instalments of 2000 marks (about 19,000*l.* sterling). By this policy it was judged that the amity of the nation would be completely secured, while England would thus be left at liberty to exert her whole strength against her potent enemy, France.

James IV. possessed every talent of a great and an accomplished prince. He was fond of military glory, of great personal courage, and of romantic generosity. He saw and pursued the true interests of his people; and such was his conduct towards his nobles, that while he maintained the authority of a monarch, he placed that confidence in them as his councillors, which

was returned by every mark of their duty and attachment. An animosity with England, which took place on account of James's affording a generous protection to Perkin Warbeck, whom he believed an injured prince, was soon after obliterated and reconciled by a marriage which Henry VII. brought about between the king of Scots and his daughter Margaret; a connexion which founded the hereditary title of James VI. to the crown of England. This amity between the kingdoms was, however, unfortunately dissolved in the succeeding reign of Henry VIII. James, instigated by the French, the ancient allies of Scotland, then at war with Henry, and exasperated at the taking of some Scottish ships, and a few other circumstances which his high spirit interpreted into national affronts, much against the opinion of the chief and best of his counsellors, determined on a war with England. He levied an army of 50,000 men; and such was the attachment of his grandees, that the whole body of the Scottish nobility appeared, with all their dependents, under the banners of their sovereign. They entered the county of Northumberland, and were met by the earl of Surrey in the field of Flodden. The address of the English general in avoiding an engagement till his army was reinforced; while the Scots, wanting provisions, in an enemy's country, and weakened by daily desertions, were reduced at length to a great inferiority of force; and the imprudent heroism of James in quitting a most advantageous post upon an eminence to attack the English, who were marshalled upon

the plain—were the causes of a total and miserable defeat of the Scottish army. Five thousand were left dead upon the field of Flodden, among whom was the king himself, and almost the whole nobility of the kingdom. This fatal battle was fought on the 9th of September, 1513. A confused rumour of the event of the engagement reached Edinburgh on the next day; when the magistrates of the capital ordered a proclamation to be made, which has a striking similarity to one which the reader remembers to have been issued by the senate of Rome.

The Scottish proclamation runs in the following words: — "Forasmuch as there is a great rumour newly arisen within this city touching our sovereign lord and his army, of which there is hitherto no certainty, we strictly command that all manner of persons, townsmen within this city, make ready their arms of defence and weapons of war, and that they appear marshalled therewith at the tolling of the common bell, for holding out and defending the city against all who may seek to invade the same. And we also charge and require that all women do repair to their work, and be not seen upon the street clamouring and crying, under pain of banishment; and that the women of better sort do repair to the church, and there offer up their prayers to God for the safety of our sovereign lord and his army."

It is curious to compare this with the decree of the senate, as recorded by Livy, upon the event of the battle of Cannæ, and the Scottish proclamation will not suffer by the comparison;

since, with the same expression of calm and determined fortitude, there is less of that parade of words, which, by endeavouring to conceal fear, often betrays it.

James V., at the death of his father, was an infant of a year old. The regency of the kingdom was conferred on the duke of Albany, grand-uncle to the king, a native of France, and consequently a stranger to the laws, manners, and genius of the people whom he governed. The disaster of Flodden, which had so greatly weakened the Scottish nobility, had not deprived the remnant of that body of their ancient spirit of ambition and independence. This long minority gave them time to recover strength; and some extraordinary exertions of authority in the regent had combined them in a very formidable association against the power of the crown, which James, upon assuming the government, found it an extremely difficult task to moderate and restrain. "We discern in the character of James V.," says Dr. Robertson, "all the features of a great and uncultivated spirit. On the one hand, violent passions, implacable resentment, an immoderate desire of power, and the utmost rage at disappointment. On the other, love to his people, zeal for the punishment of private oppressors, confidence in his favourites, and the most engaging openness and affability of behaviour."

Under a monarch of this disposition, had it been possible to restrain the turbulent spirit of a factious nobility, the nation might have arrived at happiness and splendour. But ambition once

kindled in the breasts of his nobles, and encroachments attempted on the power of the crown, this high-spirited prince formed, from the beginning of his reign, a deliberate design of humbling and reducing them to subjection. To effect this purpose his plan was deeper and more systematic than that of any of his predecessors. The church, which was under the influence of the crown, was naturally hostile to the body of the nobles, who were their rivals in wealth and power. With the concurrence of the clergy, whom he knew he could always command, James determined effectually to abase the power of the grandees*. He chose his councillors from the church, men of consummate abilities, whom he raised to all the offices of trust and confidence. His prime minister was the cardinal Beaton, an ecclesiastic of very superior genius, who concurred with great keenness and satisfaction in the designs of his sovereign. The nobles, removed entirely from all share in the councils of state, and many of them punished with ex-

* In order to repress the predatory, ferocious, and most turbulent spirit of the northern chieftains, many of whom had exchanged their allegiance to their native prince, for a league of alliance with Henry VIII. of England, James, with a bold and magnanimous policy, circumnavigated the greatest part of his dominions, visiting the whole of the coast to the north of the river Forth, and then, bending his course by the islands of Orkney to the Western Islands, attended by an armament of twelve ships completely manned and furnished with heavy artillery,—he awed into submission the rebellious chieftains, and insisted on their delivering into his hands the principal offenders, whom he detained as hostages for the obedience and peaceable subjection of all their followers.

treme rigour for very slight offences, were restrained only by their own weakness from breaking out into open rebellion. One imprudent measure of the king gave them at lenth an opportunity of taking a severe, though an ignominious revenge.

Henry VIII., at variance with the see of Rome, and insecure of the affections of his own subjects, wished to strengthen himself by an alliance with the king of Scots; and for this purpose proposed an interview at York, where a treaty of amity was to be concluded between the two kingdoms. It was certainly the real interest of James to have concurred with these views of the king of England, which would have been of mutual benefit to both; and he engaged to meet him for that purpose; but, in the meantime, he unfortunately gave ear to the persuasions of his clergy, who, exasperated by the part which Henry had taken against the see of Rome, and apprehensive of a similar plan of reformation to that which was now taking place in England, employed all their credit with the king to prevent this alliance. They succeeded, and James disappointed the promised interview, which necessarily brought on a declaration of war on the part of Henry VIII.

The king of Scots was now obliged to court the aid of that nobility, which it had been the object of his whole reign to mortify and humiliate. An army was raised for the defence of the kingdom; but the nobles, upon the first opportunity which occurred, gave a striking proof

to what length they had carried their disaffection to their prince. The English army, after an inroad upon Scotland, being obliged from scarcity of provisions to retire again beyond the borders, an obvious advantage was offered to the Scots, who, by pursuing them, might have cut them off in their retreat. James gave his orders for that purpose, but the disaffected barons sternly and obstinately refused to advance one step beyond the limits of the kingdom. Stung to the heart with this affront, James, in a transport of rage and indignation, instantly disbanded his army and returned abruptly to his capital. From that moment his temper and disposition underwent a total change. One measure more was wanting on the part of the nobility to complete their base revenge, and to drive their sovereign to frenzy and despair. His ministers had again prevailed on some of the nobles to assemble their followers, and to attempt an inroad on the western border; but the chief command was given to one of the king's favourites, who was to them particularly obnoxious. So great was their resentment, that a general mutiny instantly took place, and a resolution was formed unparalleled in history. The Scottish army, consisting of 10,000 men, surrendered themselves prisoners to a body of 500 of the English without attempting to strike a blow. On the news of this disgraceful event, the spirit of James totally sunk under the tumult of contending passions, and, overcome with melancholy and despair, he died of a broken heart in the thirty-third year of his age, a few days after his queen had been delivered of a

daughter, the unfortunate Mary, queen of Scots, a princess whose eventful life we shall briefly delineate, in treating of the reign of her contemporary Queen Elizabeth.

I shall here, in the meantime, make some observations on the ancient constitution of the Scottish government. We have hitherto seen the kings of Scotland employed in a constant struggle towards reducing the exorbitant power of the nobles, who, looking back to those barbarous periods when the rude state of the country, with the want of laws and of policy, made them independent sovereigns in their distant provinces, were continually aiming at the same degree of power and authority which had been enjoyed by their ancestors. Their oppressive and tyrannical measures, and the dangers with which the crown was often threatened by those barons who possessed great wealth and a most formidable vassalage, were sufficient motives for those exertions on the part of the sovereign to reduce them to submission and obedience. The welfare of the country required it, the happiness of the people called aloud for the repression of their tyrannical authority, of which there can be no stronger proof than that, in those attempts of the Scottish kings to humble their nobility, the people almost always took the part of their sovereign. It is well observed by Dr. Robertson, that "if these attempts to humiliate their nobility were not attended with success, we ought not for that reason to conclude that they were not conducted with prudence. Accidental events concurred with political causes in rendering the best con-

certed measures abortive. The assassination of one king, the sudden death of another, and the fatal despair of a third, contributed no less than its own natural strength to preserve the aristocracy from ruin." But, in the meantime, the attempt was laudable, and the consequences were durably beneficial. A new system was formed of many excellent laws, and order and good policy began gradually to take place of anarchy, violence, and rapine.

In the framing of these laws, the king seems to have possessed almost the sole legislative power; the reason of which it is easy to explain. The Scottish parliament, when it first began to take a regular form, which was in the reign of James I., after the exemption of the lesser barons, or landholders, from personal attendance, consisted of three estates; the nobles, or great barons; the ecclesiastics, or dignified clergymen; and the representatives of the boroughs and shires. The churchmen were devoted to the sovereign, who had the nomination of all vacant bishoprics and abbeys, and they equalled in number the body of the nobles; and the influence of the crown was always sufficient to secure a majority among the representatives of the boroughs and counties. Besides, there was one singular part of the Scottish constitution, which furnished an additional source of the crown's influence in parliament. This was the committee termed the Lords of the Articles, whose business it was to prepare and digest all matters which were to be laid before the parliament, and who had the power of approving or rejecting all motions for

new laws and ordinances; a very extraordinary court, which, in fact, possessed in itself the essential powers of legislation, of which the parliament was no more than the mouth or vehicle. These lords of the articles were chosen jointly by the three estates, but from the mode of their election were virtually at the king's nomination *. In some instances they seem to have been appointed by the monarchs solely. Certain it is, however, that they were generally obedient and obsequious to their will. Hence the king had the absolute command of parliament, and it is much to the

* "The lords of the articles were constituted after this manner. The temporal lords chose eight bishops; the bishops elected eight temporal lords. These sixteen named eight commissioners of counties, and eight burgesses; and without the previous consent of those thirty-two persons no motion could be made in parliament. As the bishops were entirely devoted to the court, it is evident that all the lords of the articles, by necessary consequence, depended on the king's nomination; and the prince, besides one negative, after the bills had passed through parliament, possessed indirectly another before their introduction."—Hume's History of England, vol. vi. p. 428. The lords of the articles appear first in the records of a parliament held at Perth by David II., 1370, under the description of a committee elected "by the consent of the three communities assembled," to treat and deliberate on "certain *special* and *secret* affairs of the king and kingdom before they came to the knowledge of the general council."—4to. Register, f. v. 40. By and by, the whole business of parliament was exclusively conducted by this committee, who being named in the first day of the session, the other members were immediately declared to be at liberty to depart to their respective homes, and often did not assemble till next year, in order to give their ratification to the laws which the committee had framed. See Pinkerton's History of Scotland, vol. i., for an instructive and curious account of the origin, progress, and constitution of the Scottish parliament.

credit of the Scottish monarchs, as proved by the excellence of their laws, that there are very few instances of their abusing this authority.

The kings of Scotland retained themselves a supreme jurisdiction in all causes, civil or criminal, within the kingdom. This jurisdiction they were formerly accustomed to exercise by their privy council; till the year 1425, when, in the reign of James I., a new court was erected, consisting of the chancellor and a certain number of judges chosen by the king out of the three estates of parliament; and to them was transferred the jurisdiction of the privy council; the king retaining, as a prerogative, his right of judging in all causes which he should think proper to decide himself. This new tribunal was termed the Court of Session. It was new modelled by James V., and its jurisdiction limited to civil causes; while the cognizance of crimes was committed exclusively to the justiciary, who had anciently a mixed civil and criminal jurisdiction. The Court of Session in Scotland was, till the middle of the seventeenth century, composed of an equal number of laymen and ecclesiastics: since that time it has consisted entirely of laymen, whose office is the cognizance of civil causes without any portion of that ancient ministerial jurisdiction which belonged to the Scottish privy council. The highest of the officers of the crown was the chancellor of Scotland. He had the direction of all grants from the crown; and all gifts of offices, all writs and precepts in judicial proceedings, received their sanction from him. In the reign of James III.,

we find the chancellor ranked immediately after the princes of the blood; and in the reign of Charles II., it was declared specially by law, that the chancellor, in virtue of his office, was perpetual president in the Scottish parliament, and in all the public judicatures in the kingdom.

Anciently, indeed, the highest officer of the crown had been the great *justiciar*, or justice general, for he exercised an universal jurisdiction, both civil and criminal; and, in the absence of the sovereign, acted as viceroy of the kingdom. After the institution, however, of the court of session, and the appointment of a court of criminal judges, this officer seems to have yielded in importance and dignity to the chancellor. Other officers of state likewise, who possessed high powers, were the chamberlain, the seneschal, or high steward, the high constable, and the mareschal. The chamberlain, besides the care of the king's person, had the administration of the finances and the care of the public police. To the high steward belonged the government of the king's household and family. The constable possessed a supreme jurisdiction in all points of honour, and in all matters connected with war, and the mareschal was the king's lieutenant and master of the horse.

The revenues of the sovereigns of Scotland arose from the same sources as those of all other feudal princes. The crown possessed certain lands in demesne, which, in process of time, it may be supposed were continually increasing by forfeitures and escheats. The feudal casualties likewise brought in considerable sums to the

royal exchequer. The profits of wardships, reliefs, and marriages of the king's vassals were very great. The king enjoyed the revenues of all vacant bishoprics; he imposed arbitrary fines for crimes and trespasses; and finally, he was entitled to demand aids and presents from the subject upon various occasions—such as the marriage of a princess, or the knighting of a prince. In short, it is reasonable to imagine that the revenue of the kings of Scotland was at all times sufficient for the support of the dignity of the crown, and adequate to the wants of the sovereign and the purposes of government.

The era when the kingdom of Scotland seems to have become of considerable consequence in the political system of Europe, was the reign of James IV., when Francis I. of France found it necessary to engage the Scottish monarch in a war with England, to prevent Henry VIII. from carrying his arms into the continent.

The political principles which the Scots followed with respect to themselves and their neighbours were obvious and simple. Scotland, by its local situation, was connected with too powerful a neighbour, England, whose great and unremitting aim it was to acquire the sovereignty of this country, and to join to her weaker sister as an appanage. Scotland was always on her guard. The Scots, conscious of the perpetual aim of their potent neighbours, and spurning the thought of dependence, of course attached themselves to France, the natural enemy of England; an alliance equally courted by the French, as favourable to their own interest. In those days, that

attachment was esteemed patriotic and favourable to liberty and independence, while, on the other hand, the Scots who were the partisans of England were justly deemed traitors to their country. From the period of which we now treat, we shall see it become a settled policy with the English monarchs to secure an interest in this country by keeping up a secret faction in the pay of England, whose object was to direct such public measures as were most expedient for that kingdom. To this source we shall find Scotland to have been indebted for the greatest part of her subsequent misfortunes.

CHAPTER XVI.

View of the Progress of Literature and Science in Europe.

For the sake of a connected view of the Scottish history during the reign of the five Jameses, we have anticipated somewhat in the order of time. We return now to the end of the fifteenth century, a period which may be considered as the epoch of the revival of literature in Europe from that long lethargy in which it had continued for above one thousand years. It is important to consider at some length this interesting subject, and to unite in one connected picture a view of the progessive advancement of European literature, and of its state at this remarkable era.

It is generally admitted that the Arabians were the first restorers of literature in Europe, after that extinction which it suffered from the irruption of the barbarous nations, and the fall of the Western empire. About the beginning of the eighth century, this enterprising people, in the course of their Asiatic conquests, found many manuscripts of the ancient Greek authors, which they carefully preserved; and in that dawn of mental improvement which now began to appear at Bagdad, the gratification which the Arabians

received from the perusal of those manuscripts was such that they requested their caliphs to procure from the Constantinopolitan emperors the works of the best Greek writers. These they translated into Arabic; but the authors who chiefly engaged their attention were those who treated of mathematical, metaphsical, and physical knowledge. The Arabians continued to extend their conquests, and to communicate their knowledge to some of the European nations, which at that time were involved in the greatest ignorance. The Arabians, after their conquests in Spain, founded there several universities; and Charlemagne, likewise, whose zealous encouragement of learning we have already remarked, ordered many of their books to be translated from Arabic into Latin, which, being circulated over his extensive dominions, soon became familiar to the Western world. In imitation of the Saracens, too, that monarch founded several universities, among which were those of Bologna, Pavia, Osnaburg, and Paris *.

After the example of Charlemagne, the English Alfred, posterior to him about fifty years, introduced among the Anglo-Saxons a taste for

* The President Hénault questions that opinion which attributes the foundation of the University of Paris to Charlemagne. "It is not attested," says he, "by any contemporary writer. In all probability the first rise of the university was towards the end of the reign of Lewis the Young; but the name itself did not begin to be used till the reign of St. Lewis; so that Peter Lombard may be looked upon as its founder. Then it was that colleges were erected, different from the schools belonging to the chapters," &c.—Hénault, Abr. Chron.

literature, of which he himself, a most accomplished character, possessed a remarkable share. He encouraged learning, not only by his own example, but by founding seminaries and rewarding the labours of ingenious men. But these favourable appearances were blasted no less by the ignorance and barbarism of his successors, than by the continual disorders of the kingdom from the Danish incursions; and from the age of Alfred to the Norman conquest, there was in England a long night of the most illiberal ignorance. At the period of the conquest, the Normans brought from the continent, where learning had not suffered the same extinction, a very considerable degree of cultivation, which diffused itself over all the kingdom. The Latin versions of the Greek authors from the Arabic translations were imported into England; and the bishops settled by the Conqueror, who were chiefly foreigners, possessed a much greater portion of erudition than their predecessors. The several convents and abbeys began to found libraries; and in all the great monasteries there was an apartment called the *Scriptorium*, where many monks were constantly employed in transcribing books for their library.

However absurd to the eye of reason and philosophy may appear the principle which led to monastic seclusion, the obligations which learning owes to those truly deserving characters who, in ages of barbarism, preserved alive, in their secluded cloisters, the embers of the literary spirit, ought never to be forgotten. The ancient Classics were multiplied by transcripts, to which

undoubtedly we owe the preservation of such of the Greek and Roman authors as we now possess entire. Even the original labours of some of those monkish writers are possessed of considerable merit, and evince an honest zeal for the cultivation of letters which does them the highest honour.

In this period of the dawn of erudition, Britain produced several authors of very considerable eminence; of these, I shall enumerate a few of the most remarkable. Henry of Huntingdon wrote, in not inelegant Latin, Poems on philosophical subjects, several books of Epigrams, and Love Verses. Geoffrey of Monmouth, a most laborious inquirer after British antiquity, was bishop of St. Asaph in the year 1152. We have mentioned formerly his History of the Exploits of Arthur, King of the Britons, as being one of the first works which laid the foundation of romantic history in Europe. John of Salisbury was a most distinguished ornament of this age. His "Polycraticon" is (in the opinion of Mr. Watson) "a very pleasant miscellany, replete with erudition, and a judgment of men and things which properly belongs to a more sensible and reflecting period." William of Malmesbury stands in no mean rank as an historian. His merits have been displayed and much recommended by Lord Lyttleton, in his "History of Henry II." Giraldus Cambrensis deserves particular regard for the universality of his genius, which embraced a wide circle of history, antiquities, divinity, philosophy, and poetry.

But the most remarkable genius in this age

for classical composition, was Josephus Iscanus, or Joseph of Exeter, who has written two Latin epic poems, which might have been read with pleasure even in a more cultivated age *. The one is on the subject of the Trojan war, of which the historical facts are taken from "Dares Phrygius;" the other is entitled "Antiocheis," the War of Antioch, or the Crusade, a subject for the choice of which Voltaire has given great credit to Tasso; although it is not improbable that he adopted the hint from this ancient poem, which in his age might have been entire, though there remains of it now only a small fragment. The poem on the Trojan war, however, is entirely preserved, and has been frequently printed along with "Dares Phrygius" and "Dictys Cretensis."

But this dawning of literature was soon obscured, not only in Britain, but over all Europe. From the time of the conquest we may compute the era of a good taste in learning to have subsisted for little more than a century. The cultivation of polite literature and of classical composition was then neglected, to make room for the barbarous subtleties of scholastic divinity. The first teachers of this art were Lombard, archbishop of Paris, and Peter Abelard, so celebrated for his amours and misfortunes; men whose extensive erudition qualified them for better undertakings than to confound the common sense of mankind with frivolous and unintelligible speculations. From this period, school divinity was judged to be the only pursuit worthy

* Morhofii Polyhistor, i. 4. ii. 10.

of the attention of mankind; till the science of the law, from the discovery of the Pandects at Amalfi, introduced subtleties of another kind, which came in for their share of the prize of public estimation. The relish for elegant literature was now entirely lost, and—while the learned were busy disputing in their colleges and cloisters on law and theology—ignorance and barbarism were gradually drawing their gloomy curtain once more over the minds of the rest of mankind.

The only amusement of the common people at this time which deserves the name of literary, was in the old metrical and prose romances, and, what had yet much less merit and more absurdity, wild and unintelligible books of prophecies in rhyme. The works of Geoffrey of Monmouth and the fabulous Turpin, with the abundant offspring derived from their stock, were in high estimation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In the middle of the thirteenth century, however, arose a genius of singular eminence, who, piercing at once through the thickest cloud of ignorance and barbarism, seemed formed to enlighten Europe. This was Roger Bacon, an English Franciscan friar, who in variety and extent of genius is entitled most deservedly to the highest rank in the annals of European literature. He was acquainted with all the ancient languages, and familiar with the works of their best authors. At that time, when every pretender to knowledge drew his creed of science from the works of Aristotle, and servilely adhered to his dogmas and

opinions, the genius of Roger Bacon saw the insufficiency of that philosophy; and he began to apply himself with indefatigable industry to that method of investigation by experiment, and by the observation of nature, which was afterwards, at the distance of four centuries, so happily pursued and so strenuously recommended by an illustrious philosopher of the same name, Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam. In the "Opus Majus" of Roger Bacon, he declares that if it had been in his power, he would have burnt the whole works of Aristotle, *quia eorum studium non est nisi temporis amissio, et causa erroris, et multiplicatio ignorantiæ.* Accordingly this great man, applying himself to the improvement of philosophy by observation and experiment, distinguished himself by some of the most important discoveries in astronomy, in optics, in chemistry, in medicine, and in mechanics. He observed an error in the calendar with regard to the duration of the solar year, which had been increasing from the time that it was regulated by Julius Cæsar. He proposed a plan for the correction of this error to Pope Clement IV., and has treated of it at large in the fourth book of his "Opus Majus." Dr. Jebb, his editor and commentator, is of opinion that this was one of the noblest discoveries ever made by the human mind. In his optical works, he has very plainly described the construction and use of telescopic glasses; an invention which Galileo 400 years afterwards attributed to himself; and, indeed, that great philosopher probably might have made over

again for himself the discovery of a secret which, from the days of Roger Bacon to his own, seems to have been totally forgotten*. These instruments, he informs us, were made of round glasses, some of which had the property of burning at a great distance. One of these immense burning glasses, he tells us, a friend of his had laboured three years in constructing; but that now, by the favour of God, he would soon have it completed. Roger Bacon and his contemporary Albertus Magnus, a German monk, were the first Europeans who cultivated chemistry with any success. There is every reason to believe, from the works of Bacon, that the composition and effects of gunpowder were known to him. "In omnem distantiam," says he, "quam volumus, possumus artificialiter componere ignem comburentem, ex sale petræ et aliis." Yet with all this superiority of genius and wonderful extent of knowledge, Roger Bacon firmly believed in the possibility of the transmutation of metals into gold; in an elixir for the prolongation of life; and in the possibility of predicting future events from the aspect of the heavenly bodies; errors which kept their ground many ages after his day, and have had their advocates, in times comparatively modern, among men even of the most superior genius.

* The words of Bacon are not at all ambiguous. "Possunt sic figurari perspicua ut longissime posita appareant propinquissima; ita ut ex incredibili distantiâ legeremus literas minutissimas, et numeraremus res quantumcunque parvas. Sic etiam faceremus solem et lunam descendere secundum apparentiam hic inferius."

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a very general taste for poetical composition began to arise in the south of Europe, from the songs and compositions of the troubadours or Provençal poets. Their name *trobadores*, or inventors, answers nearly enough to the original meaning of the Greek word *poet*, rendered in the old Scotch usage by *maker*. Hitherto the poetical compositions in the vernacular language had been solely metrical romances; and the Latin poets of the preceding ages, we have seen, chiefly confined themselves to epic poetry. The troubadours, or poets of Provençe, wrote in their vernacular language, which was a mixed dialect of the French, the Spanish, and Italian, various poems on occasional and familiar subjects. They were the first inventors of the sonnet, which afterwards became so much in fashion among the Italians. They composed likewise pastorals, ballads, and syrventes or pasquinades, in which they satirised both their ecclesiastical and civil governors. But the compositions in which they chiefly excelled, were extempore dialogues on the subject of love, which they treated in a very refined, platonic, and metaphysical strain. In this particular species of composition they had contests of skill, in which two bards strove for the superiority, before judges, who pronounced sentence likewise in verse. Jean de Notre Dame of Aix, in a discourse upon the poetry of Provençe, has enumerated seventy-six troubadours. Among these are the names of emperors, princes, and other illustrious persons—Frederick Barbarossa —Richard Cœur-de-Lion—Beranger, count of

Provençe—and many others. Anselm Faydit and Geoffrey Rudel are names of great eminence among these ancient bards. The former was one of the minstrels in the suite of Richard I. of England upon his expedition to the Holy Land; the latter was a mad poet who fell in love with the countess of Tripoli, whom he had never seen, and who being afterwards blest with a sight of her, dropped down dead for joy. These troubadours, about the end of the twelfth century, established at Aix in Provençe, a tribunal called the Court of Love. It consisted of ladies and gentlemen of the highest rank, who determined with great solemnity all questions of love and refined gallantry. After their example, similar societies were formed in the neighbouring provinces. At Thoulouse particularly was instituted the gay society of the Seven Troubadours, who held their meetings in a garden, where they discoursed on love and poetry, and read their performances. From a desire of promoting the advancement of their favourite science, they publicly proposed a premium for the best composition, which was a violet of gold. Of the works of these troubadours, there remain many specimens; but few of them can give much pleasure, unless to those of so uncommon a taste as to relish love without passion, and poetry without nature.

The removal of the seat of the popedom from Rome to Avignon, which happened in the year 1309, first introduced the Italian poets to a familiar acquaintance with the compositions of the bards of Provençe. Then arose Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, in whose compositions, though of

a much higher nature than the songs of the troubadours, a good critic will easily discern an imitation of them.

Dante Alighieri is supposed to have invented a new species of epic poetry, by the introduction of angels and devils in place of the heathen deities; yet there is some reason to presume that the Antiochus of Ischanus, were it yet remaining, would deprive Dante of the merit of originality in that particular. His Divina Commedia, however, has far higher merits of its own. It shows genius of the very greatest order; and has never been surpassed in *terrible* pathos, or in the picturesque of descriptive power.

The compositions of Petrarch are of a very different nature. His sonnets and canzonets are exquisitely tender. He has celebrated his passion for the beautiful Laura, with the most amazing diversity of sentiment and expression. The sonnets written after the death of Laura, abound with many strokes of that simple pathetic, which is the true expression of heart-felt grief.

The poetical works of Petrarch make but a small part of his writings: as a biographer, a metaphysician, and chiefly as a moralist, he shone remarkably distinguished in the age in which he lived. From his talents, and the high esteem in which he lived with the most eminent characters of his time, he might have made an equal figure in the political as in the literary world. But his favourite taste was studious retirement, and to that and his passion for

his beautiful mistress, he sacrificed every prospect of ambition. The life of Petrarch by the Abbé de Sade, though tedious on the whole, abounds with a variety of anecdotes strongly marking the spirit of the times, and particularly the state of Italy under those incessant commotions which arose from the strife between the papal and imperial powers *.

The poetical compositions of Boccaccio are very few, and are obscured by the fame of his prose compositions: yet, if nothing more remained of him than a single sonnet which he has written upon the death of Petrarch, it would be sufficient to entitle him to the character of a most elegant and pathetic poet. Boccaccio's great work is his Decamerone, a collection of one hundred novels; many of his own invention, and many undoubtedly borrowed, but all artfully written, and those few which are of a serious nature eminently beautiful and affecting. The jocose tales are many of them loose and indelicate; and what conveys a very extraordinary idea of the manners of the age, they are all feigned to be told in the presence of a company of ladies, who are even made themselves the relaters of some stories grossly indecent.

These authors, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, seemed to have fixed the standard of the Italian

* [A life of Petrarch, more interesting to the general reader, has been given to the public by the author of this work. See an Historical and Critical Essay on the Life and Character of Petrarch, by Lord Woodhouselee.—EDITOR.]

language, which, from that early time to the present, has scarcely undergone any variation.

Contemporary with these, familiar with their works, and even personally acquainted with them, was the English Chaucer. Chaucer lived in the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. He was a man of the world, a courtier, and even a minister, for he had visited France and Italy in a public character. The Abbé de Sade, in the life of Petrarch, relates that these two illustrious poets met together in Italy at the marriage of the duke of Milan's daughter. It is not then surprising that in the poems of Chaucer we should discover an intimate acquaintance with Italian and French literature, or that amidst all the rust of a barbarous language, the verses of Chaucer should have a degree of polish superior to any of the preceding English poets. The continuance of his 'Canterbury Tales,' is somewhat similar to that of the Decamerone of Boccaccio; but the occasion on which we suppose them to have been delivered, is much more happily imagined than that figured by the Italian author.—Boccaccio supposes that during the time of the plague at Florence, ten young persons of both sexes retired to a country-house at a little distance from the city, where they passed ten days; and that their chief amusement after dinner was for each to tell a tale. Chaucer, on the other hand, supposes various pilgrims setting out on a journey to the shrine of Thomas à Becket, at Canterbury, to have met at the Tabarde Inn in Southwark, and, as was the custom in those days, to have supped together at the same table; when

relishing each other's company, they agree to travel together next day, and to relieve the fatigue of the journey by telling each a story. Of these tales, many are of extraordinary merit; they evince great knowledge of mankind, and contain many strokes of inimitable humour, while they display a fine imagination, a considerable acquaintance with classical learning, and with the contemporary literature of the French and Italians.

The friend of Chaucer, or as he terms him, his master, was Gower, a poet of less genius than elegance. His poems, which show a taste improved by an acquaintance with foreign languages and authors, are of a graver cast than those of Chaucer and are less licentious. He is mentioned by Chaucer with high approbation, under the epithet of the moral Gower.

A few years posterior to these, and hardly inferior even to Chaucer, in the detail of his execution, was the accomplished James I., king of Scotland. This prince's poem of 'Christ Kirk of the Green' abounds with genuine humour, fine imagination, and displays great knowledge of human nature.

In this period of the revival of a literary taste in the European kingdoms, Spain likewise began to emerge from ignorance and barbarism, and to produce authors whose works are read even at this day with pleasure. A college of troubadours had, in imitation of those of Provençe, been instituted in the fourteenth century at Barcelona, to which we may naturally attribute the first dawnings of a poetical, joined to a romantic

spirit, which has since become, in a manner, characteristic of the nation. In those collections of old Spanish poetry, called *romanceros* and *canzioneros*, are preserved many poetical compositions of this age, which are extremely beautiful. With the fondness of the Spaniards of this and of the suceeding age for books of chivalry and romance, every body is acquainted from the inimitable satire of Cervantes. And it may be here observed, that this author, who was a most judicious critic, has enumerated and admirably characterised all the best of the Spanish writers, whose works were known in his time, in that chapter where he describes the burning of Don Quixote's library, by the curate and the barber, who rescued from the flames only such books, both poets and prose-writers, as were possessed of real merit. The books of romance and knight-errantry compose the greatest part of that collection. The epic poems which Cervantes enumerates, as the 'Araucana' of Ercilla, the 'Austriada' of Jurado, and the 'Monserrato' of Christoval Virues, were not composed till the beginning of the sixteenth century; when, as we shall see in treating of the literature of that period, Ercilla, Garcilasso de la Vega, Lope de Vega, Mendoza, and Quevedo, carried the several departments of epic, lyric, dramatic, and satirical composition, to a height superior to what they had attained at that time in most of the European kingdoms.

But to return to the age of Dante, of Petrarch, and of Chaucer; although poetry at this time seems to have attained a high degree of splen-

dour, it cannot be said that genius greatly displayed itself in any of the other sciences. History had not attained in this, nor in the succeeding age, to much perfection in any of the European nations. The marvellous is predominant in all the historical compositions of these times, yet there are a few historians who are worthy of particular mention: — Matthew of Westminster, who composed a very tolerable chronicle of events, from the beginning of the world to the fourteenth century; Walsingham, a monk of St. Alban's, who wrote a pretty good history of the reign of Henry VI. of England, and of the civil wars between the houses of York and Lancaster; Everard the German, who composed the annals of the dukes of Austria; Peter Duysburg, a Teutonic knight, who has left a history of his order, abounding in curious matter, though communicated in a very barbarous style. Among the French, Froissart is a writer not only admirable for liveliness of style, but of considerable authority with respect to the events of the fourteenth century, especially in what regards France, England, the Netherlands, and Scotland; as is likewise Monstrelet, whose chronicle is remarkable for a bold and impartial mode of thinking, and a critical spirit superior to the age in which he lived. Philip de Commines, a worthy follower of Froissart, has happily painted the reigns of Louis XI. and of Charles VIII. Villani and Platina among the Italians, are historians of very considerable merit; and even Greece at this time, has furnished historians

worthy of notice. Pachimer, John Cantacuzenos, and Chalcondilas, are each of them eminent in the several periods which they commemorate.

The Italians, in the fifteenth century, seem to have enjoyed a high taste for classical learning. Poggio the Florentine, the secretary of several of the popes, in his researches after the monuments of ancient erudition, discovered the works of Quinctilian, the history of Ammianus Marcellinus, and some of the compositions of Cicero. He wrote himself a history of Florence in the Latin tongue, remarkable both for excellence of matter and eloquence of expression. Laurentius Valla, Philelphus, Marcillus Ficinus, Nicolaus Perotus, Picus Mirandola, Palmerinus, and Angelus Politianus, are all worthy of notice, as uniting justness of historical reflection to a classical style and purity of expression.

But the taste for classical learning was at this time far from being universally diffused. In this respect the English and the French were very far behind the Italians. A curious proof of the scarcity of books in England in the fifteenth century, and of the great impediments to study, is found in the statutes of New College at Oxford. It was ordered by one of those statutes, that no man should occupy a book in the library above one hour, or two at most, that others might not be hindered from the use of the same. The famous library, founded in Oxford by that great patron of literature, Humphrey duke of Gloucester, contained

only 600 volumes. About the commencement of the fourteenth century there were only *four classics* in the royal library at Paris. These were, a copy of some of the writings of Cicero, Ovid, Lucan, and Boëthius. The rest were chiefly books of devotion, many treatises of astrology and medicine, translated from the Arabic into Latin and French; pandects, chronicles, and romances. This library was principally collected by Charles V. of France. When the English became masters of Paris in 1425, the duke of Bedford sent this whole library, which consisted only of 850 volumes, into England, where part of it was probably the groundwork of duke Humphrey's library at Oxford. Even so late as the year 1471, when Louis XI. borrowed the works of the Arabian physician Rhasis, from the faculty of medicine at Paris, he not only deposited, by way of pledge, a great quantity of valuable plate, but was obliged to procure a nobleman to join with him as surety in a deed, by which he bound himself to return it under a considerable forfeiture.

Thus low was the general state of literature during the greater part of the fifteenth century. But a brighter period was now at hand. The latter part of this century was the era of the entire dissolution of the bonds of barbarism. It was then that classical learning began to be universally diffused, and that a genuine taste was revived for polite literature, and for the productions of the fine arts. The dispersion of the Greeks, upon the total fall of the Eastern em-

pire, and the refuge and welcome which many of the learned and ingenious of that country found among the Italians, effected very soon a surprising change upon the face of all Europe.

The more pleasing philosophy of Plato began to supersede the scholastic subtleties of Aristotle, and the court of Rome became the seat of elegance and urbanity. Nicholas V., about the year 1440, established public rewards for compositions in the learned languages, appointed professors in the sciences, and employed intelligent persons to traverse all Europe, in search of the classic manuscripts buried in the monasteries. Of the succeeding age of Pope Julius II., and his successor Leo X., and of the splendour to which the fine arts then attained, I shall, in its proper place, take particular notice.

The circumstance which, of all others, most conduced to the advancement and universal dissemination of learning at this period, was the admirable invention of the *art of printing*. Printing seems to have been invented about the year 1440, at Strasburg, by John Guttènburg, but considerably improved by John Fust and Peter Scheffer. This noble invention was, at its first appearance, deemed so extraordinary, that the servants of John Fust, who came to Paris to sell some of his early publications, were accused of magic, and the parliament ordered all their books to be committed to the flames. It must be owned, however, to the honour of Louis XI., that he condemned this decision of the Parisian judges, and ordered the value of the books to be repaid to their proprietors. What inestimable

advantages has mankind derived from this glorious art! The scanty gleanings that at this day remain to us of the wisdom of the ancients, serve only to make us regret what we feel we have undoubtedly lost of their knowledge beyond the possibility of recovery. But the art of printing gives us security for the perpetuation of the progress of the sciences in all future ages, and for their extensive circulation; a perfect assurance, that amidst all the vicissitudes in the fate of empires, no period of barbarism can ever arrive when any of the useful, or even of the polite arts, can again suffer a total extinction.

In this account of the revival of learning, and of its progress from its first appearance amid the darkness of the barbarous ages to the end of the fifteenth century, dramatic composition, which forms no inconsiderable part of polite literature, must not be forgotten.

The first dramatic representations known in Europe were devotional pieces, acted by the monks, in the churches of their convents, representative of the life and actions of our Saviour and of his apostles. In England, these representations were termed *mysteries*, and sometimes *miracles* and *moralities*. They were brought into use about the twelfth century, and continued to be performed in England even to the sixteenth century. There is, in the reign of Henry VIII., a prohibition by the bishop of London, against the performance of any plays or interludes in churches or chapels. Perhaps, at this time, profane stories had begun to take place of the sacred mysteries: it is certain, at

least, that these sacred mysteries themselves often contained great absurdities and very gross indecency *.

Profane dramas succeeded the sacred mysteries: they seem to have been known in France at an earlier period than in England; for about the year 1300 we find frequent mention of farçeurs, jongleurs, and "plaisantins, qui divertissaient les compagnies par leur comédies:" and what made a very extraordinary mixture, these farçeurs very often joined sacred and profane history in the same representation. In one of these dramatic pieces which commemorates the scripture story of Balaam, six Jews and six Gentiles are introduced, conversing on the nativity of our saviour; and among the latter is the poet Virgil, who speaks several monkish verses *in rhyme.*

Dramatic representation in Italy, appears to have been of the same nature, in these periods, with what we have have seen it in France and in England. In Spain, where learning and good taste have not since made proportional advances

* In one of them, which is entitled a 'Play of the Old and New Testament,' Adam and Eve are introduced upon the stage naked, and conversing in very strange terms about their nakedness. Mr. Warton has given a curious account of this play in his History of English Poetry. In some of the first scenes of this play, God is represented creating the world: He breathes life into Adam, leads him into Paradise, and opens his side while sleeping. Adam and Eve appear naked in the garden, and not ashamed, and the Old Serpent enters lamenting his fall. He converses with Eve: she eats of the forbidden fruit: they are cursed by God: the Serpent exit hissing: they are driven from Paradise by the Cherubim, with a flaming sword,—and Adam then appears digging the ground, and Eve spinning.

with the rest of Europe, dramatic representation, till the age of Charles V., was confined entirely to such rude and farcical debasements of the scripture histories as we have already mentioned; and even at this day such absurd performances are not entirely disused. But the patronage of Cardinal Ximenes drew forth a few sparks of genius from this general obscurity; although it was not till the end of the sixteenth century that Lope de Vega and Calderon produced those regular compositions for the stage which have stood their ground to the present day, and are confessedly the masterpieces of dramatical composition among the Spaniards.

CHAPTER XVII.

View of the Progress of Commerce in Europe before the Portuguese Discoveries.

THE last chapter shortly delineates the progress of literature in Europe, from the first dawning of knowledge, which we owed to the Arabians, to the end of the fifteenth century, when, from the discovery of the art of printing, learning and the sciences underwent at once a most astonishing improvement. The useful arts kept pace with the sciences; and this period at which we are now arrived was, in particular, remarkable for the singular advancement of navigation by the Portuguese, and those discoveries which produced the greatest effects upon the commerce of all the European nations. Previous, however, to giving an account of these discoveries, it is necessary to take a connected view of the progress of commerce in Europe, and its state during several of the preceding ages down to this period of its vigorous advancement at the end of the fifteenth century.

Nothing can show in a stronger light the small knowledge which the ancients possessed of the habitable globe, and the very limited communication which subsisted between different regions, than the opinion which universally prevailed of the earth's being uninhabitable both in the *torrid* and

in the *frigid* zones. This belief was not confined to the vulgar and illiterate: even the most learned and best informed of the ancients, and that too in a very enlightened age, had no better notions of the actual state of the habitable globe. Cicero, in his 'Somnium Scipionis,' introduces Africanus thus speaking to Scipio the Younger:—"You see this earth encompassed or bound in by certain *belts or girdles*, of which the two which are most distant and opposite are frozen with perpetual cold. The middle one, and the largest of all, is burnt up with the sun's heat. Two only are habitable; the people in the southern one are Antipodes to us, and with them we have no communication." Not to mention the poets, as Virgil and Ovid, Pliny the naturalist, and Strabo the geographer, have both delivered the same opinion. We may guess from this, how small a portion of the habitable globe was really known to the ancients. From Monsieur D'Anville's very accurate maps of ancient geography, we see that the limits of the whole surface of the earth supposed to be known to the ancients, extend no further than from the tenth degree of N. lat. to the seventieth; but, in fact, the greatest part lying even within these boundaries, was perhaps only guessed at; nor can we say that the ancients were intimately acquainted with any other regions than what lay between the tropic of Cancer, and the fifty-fifth, or at most the sixtieth degree of north latitude. To the south, in Africa, the researches of the ancients, if we except the voyage of Hanno, did not extend far beyond the provinces which border upon the Mediterranean,

and those on the western shore of the Red Sea, or *Sinus Arabicus*. To the north, they were almost totally unacquainted with those extensive countries—Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Poland, and the immense empire of Russia. Britain was not known to be an island till it was circumnavigated in the reign of the Emperor Domitian.

The Ultima Thule is generally believed to have been one of the Shetland isles. It does not appear that the Phœnicians, Carthaginians, or Greeks, had ever been within the Baltic sea. The Romans, indeed, penetrated into it, but never ascertained its limits, or knew that it was bounded by the land. Of the continent of Asia, till the time of Alexander the Great, the Greeks and Romans knew little more than what lies between the Persian Gulf and the western coast of the Caspian Sea. Those immense tracts which were termed Scythia and Sarmatia were hardly otherwise known than by name. Even when geography had attained to the highest perfection to which it ever arrived in the ancient world, which was in the second century after the Christian era, when Ptolemy published his description of the globe, the sixty-third degree of latitude bounded the earth to the north; the equinoctial limited it to the south; to the east, all beyond the Ganges was but conjectural. One fact recorded by Strabo affords a very striking proof of the great ignorance of the ancients with respect to the situation even of those kingdoms with which they had intercourse. When Alexander the Great marched along the banks of the Hydaspes and Acesina, two rivers which fall into

the Indus, he observed that there were many crocodiles in those rivers, and that the country produced beans of the same species with those which were common in Egypt. From these circumstances he concluded that he had discovered the source of the Nile, and prepared a fleet to sail down the Hydaspes into Egypt. In Europe, many even of those countries which lie between the fiftieth and sixtieth parallels of north latitude, were very imperfectly known to the Romans. What are now called the Netherlands are generally supposed to have been then in a great measure uninhabitable, and the face of the country to have been covered with woods and morasses. In the island of Zealand, indeed, the Romans seem to have had some establishments; and particularly in the island of Walcheren: near to the city of Middleburgh, there were discovered the remains of a Roman temple dedicated to the new moon, Nehalennia, the protectress of navigation. Britain was frequented by the Romans for the purposes of commerce. Tacitus, who lived in the reign of Nero, mentions the city of London, where he himself had lived for some time, as well frequented by ships and merchants. It is generally thought that the Britons had wrought the *tin*-mines of Cornwall and Devonshire long before the first Roman invasion, and that the Phœnicians, Carthaginians, and the Greeks, traded thither for that useful commodity *. Yet in general the commerce and

* The Romans had a notion, for some time, that Britain abounded in gold and silver mines; and this report, Mr. Melmoth observes, it is probable, first suggested to Cæsar

navigation of the ancients was chiefly confined to the limits of the Mediterranean and Euxine seas. What trade they carried on beyond these limits was extremely inconsiderable. The Constantinopolitan empire, however, which preserved for some centuries the last remains of the Roman power and magnificence, carried on a commerce with the Asiatic nations, far more extensive than had ever been known to the Romans in the days of their universal dominion. The citizens of Constantinople did not confine their trade to the Archipelago, to the Euxine, or even to the Mediterranean. They imported at first the commodities of the East Indies, from Alexandria;

the design of conquering our island. It was soon discovered, however, that these sources of wealth were chimerical. Cicero taking notice of this circumstance to Atticus, ridicules the poverty and ignorance of our British ancestors; and Dr. Middleton remarking on that passage, makes the following striking and useful observations: "From their railleries of this kind, one cannot help reflecting on the surprising fate and revolutions of kingdoms; how Rome, once the mistress of the world, the seat of arts, empire and glory, now lies sunk in sloth, ignorance and poverty: enslaved to the most cruel as well as the most contemptible of tyrants—superstition and religious imposture; while this remote country, anciently the jest and contempt of the polite Romans, is become the happy seat of liberty, plenty and letters, flourishing in all the arts and refinements of civil life; yet running perhaps the same course, which Rome itself had run before it; from virtuous industry to wealth, from wealth to luxury, from luxury to an impatience of discipline, and corruption of morals; till, by a total degeneracy and loss of virtue, being grown ripe for destruction, it falls a prey at last to some hardy oppressor, and with the loss of liberty losing everything else that is valuable, sinks again into its original barbarism."—Ad. Att. iv. Middleton's Life of Cicero, ii. 102.

but afterwards, when Egypt became the conquest of the Arabians, the industry of the Greeks discovered a new channel, by which the productions of India might be conveyed to Constantinople. They were carried up the Indus as far as that great river is navigable; thence they were transported by land to the banks of the river Oxus, which then ran directly into the Caspian, although that communication has now for some centuries been cut off by the lake Aral, which is a new formation. From the Caspian Sea, they entered the Wolga, and sailing up that river the goods were again carried across the land to the Tanais or Don, whence they descended directly into the Euxine or Black Sea, and thence proceeded without interruption to Constantinople; a singular proof of the ardour and ingenuity of those Greek merchants, as well as of the powerful influence of the spirit of luxury in the taste for foreign productions.

After the fall of the Roman empire in the west, the disorders of Italy during its successive subjection to the Goths, the Heruli, and the Lombards, and the turbulent state of all the European kingdoms in those ages, allowed little room for commercial intercourse. It was, however, owing to the ravages of some of those barbarous tribes, that a small state arose, which revived the commerce of Europe, and set an example of industry to the neighbouring Italian cities, which very speedily raised them to a high degree of wealth and splendour. At the northern extremity of the Adriatic Sea are a number of

small islands lying very close together, which originally were frequented only by fishermen. When Attila, king of the Huns, was ravaging Italy, the inhabitants of the district of Venetia took refuge in these islands, and forming themselves into a community, laid the foundation of the illustrious city and state of Venice*. They began soon to equip small fleets, which they sent to all parts of the Mediterranean, and particularly to the coast of Syria and Egypt, whence they brought home spices and other merchandises of the produce of Arabia and India.

The city of Genoa on the opposite coast of Italy, ambitious of sharing with Venice in this lucrative trade, soon became a formidable rival. Florence and Pisa followed the same example, and the northern Italian states were acquiring a great deal of wealth, while Rome and her pontiffs were engaged in those contentions with the emperors which disturbed the peace of a great part of Europe. These commercial states, however, incited by rivalship in trade, were often at war with each other. Venice and Genoa, during almost the space of three centuries, had frequent

* Venice is an artificial conjunction of upwards of seventy small islands, divided from each other by shallows, or as they are styled *lagunas*; some so close as to be united by bridges, others at such a distance, that there is no communication but by boats. This city is five miles distant from the main land of Italy, and about the same distance from the Lido, a causeway extending almost forty miles, which defends them from the sea; through which there are several openings that admit boats, and one upon the grand canal, well fortified, at Malamoco, which may thence be termed the Port of Venice.

hostile conflicts. The Venetians, however, came at length to outstrip all their rivals, and advancing as a military as well as a mercantile power, they acquired very considerable territories on the opposite coasts of Illyrium and Dalmatia.

The crusades, as we have formerly remarked, contributed not a little to increase the wealth of the maritime cities of Italy. The merchants employed their ships in transporting stores and provisions for those immense multitudes which flocked to the Holy Land, and they brought back from the coasts of Syria and of Egypt all the commodities of the East. Some of the most enterprising of these Italian merchants bethought themselves of establishing manufactures in their own country, in imitation of those of Constantinople. Silk stuffs (which about the time of the Emperor Diocletian were so rare in the Roman empire that they were sold for their weight in gold) were at the time of the crusades in pretty general use. Roger, king of Sicily, about the year 1130, carried off from Athens a number of artificers in the silk trade, and established a considerable manufacture in his capital of Palermo, from whence it soon spread over all Italy. The sugar-cane, which is likewise a production of Asia, was about the middle of the twelfth century introduced into Sicily, from whence it was transplanted into the southern provinces of Spain. From Spain it was carried to Madeira and the Canary Islands, and at length made its way to the American islands, where it is now chiefly cultivated. But in the middle ages it furnished

one chief article of the commerce of the Italian states.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, foreign commerce was almost confined to the Italians. It is generally allowed that Venice was the first of the European states that found out the conveniency and great advantage of a national bank for the purposes of trade. The institution of the bank of Venice is so early as the year 1157; and the other Italian states of Genoa, Florence, and Pisa, soon followed its example. It is said that its original fund was two millions of ducats. The government of Venice, in one of her wars with the Turks, was put to the necessity of making use of the bank's money to defray the necessary charges; and on that occasion the revenues of the state were pledged for the repayment of the loan. After that period, the government very frequently made use of the bank's capital upon any public emergency. This most ancient bank was ever conducted with such fairness and equity, that the *agio*, or premium upon the shares of its proprietors, would have risen to a prodigious height, had it not been enacted by an ordinance of the state that it should never exceed 20 per cent.

While commerce was thus vigorously promoted by the Italian states, it was scarcely known in any of the other nations of Europe. In the principal kingdoms of France, Spain, and Germany, there were fairs or great markets held at stated times, to which traders, or *mercatores*,

resorted from different quarters, and thus made a sort of interchange of their several products or manufactures. These mercatores were little better than hawkers or pedlers. In all the different countries of Europe (as is the case at this day in several of the Tartar governments of Asia), taxes were wont to be levied upon the persons and goods of travellers when they passed through certain manors, crossed certain bridges, or erected booths in a fair to sell their goods. These different taxes were known in England by the names of *passage, pontage, lastage*, and *stallage*. Sometimes an enterprising trader purchased from the king, or one of the great barons, an immunity from paying these taxes within a certain territory, by giving either a sum at once, or an annual tribute; and these persons, who were merchants of some note, were distinguished by the title of *free-traders*.

But the adventurous spirit of the Italian merchants soon enticed them to disperse themselves through every kingdom of Europe; and maintaining a correspondence with their own country, they became the factors of all the European nations. In the middle ages, these Italian merchants passed by the general denomination of Lombards. They were allowed to settle in France, in Spain, in Germany, and England, and even enjoyed many privileges above the natives themselves. These Lombards not only acted as merchants for the importation and exchange of commodities, but as bankers or money-dealers; though in this last branch of business they

found a heavy restraint in the ideas of the times. The canon law, proceeding upon a strict interpretation of those passages of Scripture which condemn the taking of usury, was adverse to the custom of demanding even the most moderate interest for the use of money; and hence the banking trade of these Lombard merchants, who very naturally thought themselves entitled to a premium for the loan of their money, fell under the censure of the church, and began to be deemed unlawful. They were obliged, therefore, to carry on their business as bankers to great disadvantage. Their bargains were necessarily kept private, and consequently their exactions, being arbitrary, were often most exorbitant and fraudulent.

The share taken by the Jews in the same business of banking was one strong cause why it continued so long to be in disesteem. To trade in money was considered as little else than to cheat; and accordingly we find that many of the princes of Europe looked upon the fortunes amassed by the Jews as a sort of lawful plunder, and made no scruple to despoil them of their property whenever a public emergency required a speedy supply of money. Thus, in England, King John imprisoned the Jews, in order to force a discovery of their wealth; and many of these unfortunate wretches, who would not reveal their treasures, were punished with the loss of their eyes. But these grievances, which would seem apparently calculated to repress the spirit of commerce, contributed in this instance very materially to its advancement. To guard against these tyrannute

depredations made on their property, the Jews invented bills of exchange; and commerce became by this means capable of eluding violence and of maintaining everywhere its ground: for merchants could now convert their effects into paper, and thus easily transport them wherever they thought proper.

The establishment of the Italian or Lombard merchants in the different kingdoms of Europe could not fail to excite somewhat of a spirit of industry, not only in the promotion of commerce, but of domestic manufactures. These manufactures were promoted by the sovereigns by every encouragement which they could bestow. Among the rest, corporations or monopolies of different trades began now to be established, in the view of encouraging manufactures; a policy perhaps necessary in a state of society where industry is very low, and requires every incentive to its promotion, but extremely hurtful where the industrious spirit is generally diffused. The first institution of those corporations or merchant guilds in the European kingdoms seems to have been in the eleventh century. Most authors are of opinion that they were unknown in England till the Norman invasion, and that even in France at that time they were very rare. It is not improbable that both the French and the Normans borrowed these institutions from the free cities of Italy, where, as commerce may be said to have had its origin in modern times, these communities were probably first in use. In process of time, as trading towns increased in number of inhabitants, the retailers and artisans

in these towns obtained charters for incorporating their respective callings; that is, for engrossing to themselves, and monopolising all the manufactures and even trade of the towns, to the exclusion of non-freemen; a grievance which was in later times severely felt and justly complained of.

About the end of the twelfth century the commercial spirit had begun to make some progress towards the north of Europe. The cities upon the Baltic began to equip merchant ships which traded to the ports of France and of Britain. A small island, named the Isle of Oleron, near the mouth of the river Garonne, was a rendezvous for the Mediterranean ships belonging to the Lombards, and from them the Baltic merchants furnished themselves with all the commodities of the East. The Isle of Oleron was then the property of the English, who used it as a sort of *entrepôt* in their commerce with France, Spain, and the Mediterranean. The laws of Oleron have at this day great force in all the nations of Europe, and are a standard of procedure in all Admiralty courts in maritime and mercantile questions. The merchants of Oleron, for the regulation of their extensive commerce, framed a code of laws in the time of Richard Cœur de Lion; and these were held so equitable, that most of the powers of Europe gave them obedience. In the same manner the laws of Wisbury, a considerable commercial town, situated in the island of Gothland, in the Baltic, were a rule of observance for all the mercantile states in the north of Europe.

These northern states continued to prosecute

trade with great vigour; and, animated by the example of the Italian cities, Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Florence, they began to form extensive schemes of commerce, and unite with each other in equipping considerable mercantile fleets. The Baltic Sea was then infested by pirates, who ravaged the coasts. The city of Lubec, on the Baltic, and Hamburg, at the mouth of the Elbe, ambitious of opening a trade with the neighbouring towns, and those on the opposite coasts of Norway and Sweden, were obliged to enter into a league of mutual defence for the protection of their ships against these pirates. So great were found to be the advantages of this confederacy, that in a short time it was acceded to by all the towns upon the coast, from the eastern extremity of the Baltic to the mouth of the Rhine. This association was termed the League of the Hanse Towns; and it became soon so formidable in the eyes of the princes and states of Europe, that many of them courted its alliance. It was one of the regulations of the Hanseatic League to admit no city into their confederacy which was not either free and independent, and exercised civil jurisdiction within itself, or, being dependent on any sovereign or prince, should procure from him an oath to preserve their privileges entire: a fine example how much, even in those days, the enjoyment of civil liberty was considered as essential to the prosperity of commerce.

The regulations made in the general council of the Hanseatic Towns, contributed greatly to the advancement of commercial industry over all the north of Europe. As in the trade of the

Hanseatic merchants with the southern kingdoms of Europe, it was found necessary to have an intermediate station on the coast, or *entrepôt*, where the merchants of the different kingdoms might have a general resort, the city of Bruges, on the coast of Flanders, was pitched on for that purpose, and there the northern merchants met with those of Lombardy and the South. The commodities of India, and of the East, were exchanged with the produce and manufactures of the North; and every variety of useful merchandise was, by means of the Baltic and the great continental rivers, easily conveyed through most of the kingdoms of Europe.

After the establishment of the great mart of Bruges, the Flemings began to apply their whole industry to the establishment of manufactures, and Baldwin, the young count of Flanders, encouraged this spirit by bestowing privileges and immunities on the merchants and manufacturers. His successors, however, possessed a very different spirit; they recalled these immunities; and the consequence was, that the manufacturers left Flanders and settled in Brabant, where the dukes of that province showed them for some time all manner of favour. This, however, did not long continue. The revocation of their immunities, by some impolitic sovereigns of that province, banished trade and manufactures from Brabant, as it had done from Flanders; and England now began to give them encouragement. But let us look back a little, and shortly mark the progress of the commercial spirit in this

ked that the Romans carried
ast of Britain. Tacitus men-
copia negotiatorum et com-
berrimum. In the year 614,
e mentions London as greatly
igners, who repaired thither
trade. In the time of Canute,
doners built a wooden bridge
, a work of prodigious labour,
se. William of Malmesbury,
ign of William the Conqueror,
n or about the year 1041, as a
d opulent city. In this reign,
of England, often mentioned
their privileges. Camden in
ms us, that William the Con-
ie county of Kent as the key
ted the governor of the castle
rden of five principal ports on
were Dover, Hastings, Hythe,
dwich. To these some other
ards added, and they are now
They were obliged each to
of war, which were to be at
g's command, and in considera-
they enjoyed several valuable
unities. They were free from
subsidies. Their inhabitants
n any courts but those of their
warden of these ports exercised,
tion, the authority of High
eight towns had their mem-
and they enjoyed very consi-

About what time the woollen manufacture began to be cultivated in England, there is no absolute certainty. But we know that so early as the middle of the twelfth century, it was an object of considerable attention. Howell mentions a charter granted in the middle of the twelfth century by Henry II. of England to the weavers of London, incorporating them into a society, and conferring on them various privileges and immunities. It would appear that there was at this time a considerable spirit of manufacture and trade, both in England and in Scotland. Stowe, in his Chronicles, quotes a charter of the same Henry II., in which, for the encouragement of the woollen manufacture, he enacts, that if any cloth shall be made of Spanish or foreign wool, the mayor of London shall see it burnt.

Anderson, in his Chronological History of Commerce, has remarked, that there must at this time have been some considerable trade or source of wealth in Scotland, since we find that country was able to raise so large a sum as 100,000 marks (equal to 300,000*l.* sterling at present) for redeeming William, surnamed the Lion, who having a dispute with Henry II. of England, concerning the property of a part of Northumberland, was taken prisoner by a stratagem. The one half of this sum was paid down immediately in coin, the other half was to be paid upon time; and the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Huntingdon, which then belonged to the kings of Scotland, were given in pledge for it. The disproportion of wealth

between the two kingdoms must not have been so great at that time as in after periods, since we find how difficult it was for England, a few years after the time of which we now speak, to raise but twice as much for the ransom of Richard I., and towards this ransom, William, king of Scotland, generously contributed a considerable sum. Campbell, in his Political Survey, tells us that part of the ransom of Richard I. was raised by a loan of wool; from whence he rightly infers, that before that time it must have been a staple commodity in England, and the statute we have mentioned of Henry II. shows this to have been the fact.

Even in those early periods the woollen manufacture was an object of considerable importance to government. The kings of England drew a very large revenue from the custom upon wool exported, a great part of which was carried to be manufactured in the Low Countries. By-and-by, however, the English monarchs became sensible of the superior benefits of encouraging a home manufacture. Some of the foreign merchants and manufacturers were invited to reside in England. Henry III., in the year 1266, granted to the merchants of the Steelyard (who were a set of Hanseatic traders residing in London) several special immunities, particularly that of importing and exporting all merchandise whatever, for the payment only of one per cent. Edward III., a prince of great spirit and abilities, amidst all the splendour of his military enterprises, bestowed particular attention on every thing that could contribute to the promotion of the sub-

stantial interest of his people. He endeavoured to entice the Flemish artisans to settle in his dominions; he enacted a variety of excellent laws for the encouragement of trade, and strenuously promoted the woollen manufacture, which has since become the chief source of wealth of the nation.

From the death of this monarch, the commercial spirit of the English was for many years on the decline. His successor, Richard II., a weak and impolitic prince, was prevailed on by some of the London merchants to revoke those privileges granted by Edward III. to the foreign merchants; and the consequence was, that even the merchants of Britain soon began to perceive the pernicious effects of this revocation to their own trade, and thought it their wisest policy again to petition the king for a restoration of the privileges of foreigners. In the succeeding reigns, the nation being engaged in a war of many years with France, and afterwards embroiled at home by the disorders arising from the hostile contentions of the houses of York and Lancaster, it was a necessary consequence that the spirit of trade must have languished and decayed; nor was it till these latter disorders were appeased by the accession of Henry VII. to the throne, that commerce again began to occupy the national industry, and engage the attention of the legislature, or rather of the sovereign. We must, however, observe, that in this intermediate space of time, when the commerce of England seems to have been at a stand, or rather to retrograde, the spirit of trade was vigorously promoted among the Scots by that ex-

cellent, wise, and politic prince, James I., as fully appears by the acts of the Scottish parliament passed in his reign. James prevented, by statute, the exportation of gold and silver from his kingdom. He obliged foreign merchants to lay out the money they had received for the merchandise they had imported, in the purchase of the commodities of the country. We find, likewise, in his acts of parliament, mention made of the custom on the exportation of herrings, which, even in those early ages, formed a very capital article of trade, and of a duty on the exportation of woollen cloth, which manufacture it would appear the Scots had at this time borrowed from their neighbours of England. It was in the reign of James I. that the city of Glasgow began to show the first indication of that commercial spirit for which she has since been so remarkably distinguished. Glasgow, at this time, was a small village, consisting of little else than the houses of the clergy belonging to the metropolitan church. A merchant of the name of Elphinston, engaging in the fisheries upon the coast, and accumulating considerable wealth, inspired his fellow-citizens with a similar ambition. But the progress of the trade of Glasgow was not rapid. Her situation upon the western coast of the island was extremely disadvantageous, in times when all the trade, as we have seen, lay with the Hanseatic merchants, and the Italians resorting to Oleron, or Bruges. In fact, it was not till after the trade with America and the West Indies was open to Europe, that Glasgow became at all considerable as a commercial town. It was then that she found her situation equally commodious for the western

trade, as it had formerly been disadvantageous for the eastern.

Henry VII. of England, attentive to every thing that could conduce to the welfare and prosperity of his kingdom, revived that spirit of commerce, which had languished from the time of Edward III.; he enacted many excellent laws, and particularly those navigation acts, which statuted that no French wines should be imported into the kingdom, unless in British and Irish ships. He likewise encouraged the woollen manufacture, by inducing many Flemish workmen to settle in the kingdom, and giving them establishments in Yorkshire, which was the first rise of those great manufacturing towns of Leeds, Wakefield, and Halifax. He concluded likewise commercial treaties with the principal European powers, for the protection of the merchant-shipping; and through the whole of his reign made the advancement of trade a principal concern of his parliaments.

Such was the state of the commerce of the European nations at the time when the Portuguese made those valuable discoveries in navigation which gave to Europe the trade of the East Indies.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Discoveries of the PORTUGUESE in the Fifteenth Century, and their effect on the Commerce of Europe.—Madeira discovered —Pope's Bull, granting to the Portuguese the Countries explored by them—They double the Cape of Good Hope—De Gama reaches India—Goa taken—Their objects traversed by the Venetians—Portuguese sail to China—Establish Macao—Effects on European Commerce—Rise of Antwerp and Amsterdam—Progress of Commerce and Manufactures in England.

As many of the most useful inventions in the arts have been the result of accident, it is not surprising that some even of the most remarkable of these should have been for ages known to mankind before they were called forth, or applied to any purposes of utility. The property of the *magnetic needle*, in turning constantly to the northern pole, was known in Europe as early as the thirteenth century; but it was not till above a century after that any one attempted to apply it to the purposes of navigation. That most ancient nation, the Chinese, are, indeed, said to have known the property of the magnet for a thousand years before us; yet it is believed that, till *our* seventeenth century, when European example had reached them, they had never

thought of using it in sailing. The English, in the reign of Edward III., are said to have first employed the compass in their ships, but the world owed to the Portuguese the first great experiments of the value of this invention in the advancement of navigation. Till the middle of the fifteenth century, none of the nations of Europe had ventured to sail out of the sight of their coasts. Their vessels were flat-bottomed, and extremely shallow; and, as they followed in their navigation every turning of the coast, which exposed them continually to shifting and contrary winds, it was not unusual that a voyage, which would now be performed in a few months, lasted at that time four or five years. We have already remarked the very limited knowledge which the Greeks and Romans possessed of the habitable globe. The Eastern Ocean was known only by name, and the Atlantic scarcely attempted out of the sight of the coast of Europe. It was supposed that all to the west was an immense extent of ocean. The famous island of Atlantis, which Plato supposed to be situated in this sea, was a chimera of his own, and was generally treated as such. The torrid zone, as we have formerly remarked, was generally believed by the ancients to be uninhabitable from its heat; and this persuasion had prevented them, in their coasting voyages, from going beyond the northern tropic. The *Periplus* of Hanno is, indeed, an exception; but it is probable that he did not very well know the extent of his own voyage, which is supposed to have reached within five degrees of the line. If the

BLOOMINGDALE

ancients were acquainted with the coast of Africa thus far, it is at least certain, that the moderns, down to the period of the fifteenth century, never attempted to sail beyond the twenty-ninth degree of north latitude; and a promontory, on the African coast, lying in that parallel, was termed Cape Non, as being supposed the utmost limits of the habitable globe to the south.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century, John I., king of Portugal, having sent a considerable armament of ships to attack the Moors settled on the coast of Barbary, a few vessels were despatched, at the same time, with instructions to sail along the western shore of Africa, and to bring an account of the state of the countries beyond Barbary, which, it was supposed, might be incited to co-operate in the design of conquering the Moors *. The vessels sent on this enterprise doubled Cape Non, and proceeded at once one hundred and sixty miles beyond it to another promontory, named Cape Boyador, within two degrees of the tropic of Cancer. But here the mariners, begin

* The Portuguese writers acknowledge that the island of Madeira was discovered by one Masham, an Englishman, who carried thither a lady he had stolen; and, after her death, endeavouring to escape, was taken by the inhabitants of Africa; who, on account of his being overgrown with hair, by living long in a desolate place, sent him as a present to Don Pedro, then king of Castile; and to this Masham's reports they ascribe all their own and the Spaniards' subsequent discoveries.—Campbell's Political Survey, vol. i. p. 52.—Asia de Joan de Barros, decad. 1. lib. 1. cap. iii.—Hakluyt's Translation of D. Ant. Galvano's Discoveries, 4to. p. 2.—Purchase's Pilgrims, vol. ii., pp. 1671, 1672.

affrighted by the rugged appearance of the coast, and a very tempestuous sea, returned to Portugal, and got great credit for the boldness of the attempt. Prince Henry, the son of John, king of Portugal, was a young man of great talents, possessed of that ardour which is fitted to patronise and promote every beneficial design, and that enthusiasm which the dangers and difficulties of an enterprise rather inflame than relax. Struck with the success of this first attempt of his countrymen, he endeavoured to engage in his service all who were eminent for their skill in navigation, both Portuguese and foreigners. His first effort, however, was with a single ship, which was despatched with instructions to attempt, if possible, the doubling of Cape Boyador *. The mariners, as usual, were afraid to quit the coasts, and consequently encountered numberless difficulties. A squall

* In this manly and spirited undertaking, it appears that Prince Henry had to encounter the inveterate prejudices of his countrymen. "The systematic philosophers," says a well-informed writer, "were alarmed lest their favourite theories should be perverted by the acquisition of real knowledge; the military beheld with impatience the increase of fame that was obtained by a profession they had always considered as inferior to their own; the nobility dreaded opening a source of wealth, which might equalise the ascendency of rank; and the indolent and splenetic argued, that it was presumption to search for a passage to the southern extremity of Africa, which the wisest geographers had pronounced to be impracticable. *It was even hinted, as a probable consequence, that the mariners, after passing a certain latitude, would be changed into blacks, and thus retain for ever a disgraceful mark of their temerity.*"—Clark's Progress of Maritime Discovery.

of wind, however, driving them out to sea, landed them on a small island to the north of Madeira, which they named Porto Santo: thence they returned to Portugal to give an account of their discovery. Three ships were fitted out by Prince Henry the subsequent year, which, passing Porto Santo, discovered the island which they denominated Madeira, from its being *covered with wood.* Here they fixed a small colony, and planted slips of the Cyprus vine, and of the sugar-cane from Sicily, for both which productions the island was remarkably favourable. I have formerly observed that it was from this island that the sugar-cane was transplanted to the West Indies, of which it is not a native.

The Portuguese, once accustomed to launch into the open sea, no longer kept to their former timid mode of navigation. In their first voyage after the discovery of Madeira, they passed Cape Boyador, and in the space of a few years, advancing above four hundred leagues to the south, they had discovered the river Senegal, and all the coast between Cape Blanco and Cape Verd; they were now near ten degrees within the torrid zone, and were surprised to find the climate still temperate and agreeable—yet, on passing the river Senegal, and observing the human species to assume a different form, the skin as black as ebony, the woolly hair, and that peculiarity of feature which distinguishes the Negroes, they naturally attributed this to the influence of heat, and began to dread the consequences of a nearer

approach to the line. They returned to Portugal with the account of their discoveries, and the common voice of their countrymen dissuaded them from making any further attempts. But the enthusiasm of Prince Henry was redoubled by the success of these experiments; and he resolved to employ the operation of a new and very powerful motive to the prosecution of his schemes of discovery. He applied to the Pope Eugene IV., and representing that the chief object of his pious wishes was to spread the knowledge of the Christian religion among those barbarous and idolatrous nations which occupied the greatest part of the continent of Africa, he procured a *bull*, conferring on the Portuguese an exclusive right to all the countries which they had discovered, or might discover, between Cape Non and the continent of India. Ridiculous as such a donation appears to us, it was never doubted at that time that the pope had a right to confer it, and, what is very singular, all the European powers, for a considerable space of time, paid the most implicit deference to the grant, and acknowledged the exclusive title of the Portuguese to almost the whole continent of Africa.

The death of Prince Henry imposed a temporary check on this spirit of enterprise, which revived, however, about twenty years afterwards, under the reign of John II. of Portugal. The Cape Verd Islands were colonised and planted; and the Portugese fleets, advancing to the coast of Guinea, returned with a cargo of gold dust, ivory, gums, and other valuable commodities.

This enterprising people, perceiving now that they were to reap a substantial reward for the dangers and difficulties they had encountered, pushed onwards with great vigour to the south. They perceived presently that this immense continent began greatly to contract itself and to bend towards the East, which encouraged a hope that in place of extending (as the ancients supposed) to the south pole, its boundary by the sea was at no great distance. They passed the equator, and, for the first time, saw a new hemisphere, and perceived those stars which mark the southern pole of the earth. The magnet, which had hitherto pointed constantly to the north, it was now expected would have changed its direction and pointed to the south pole; but it still kept invariably to the north. The Portuguese, nevertheless, sailed on with intrepidity, and at length came in sight of the great promontory which forms the extremity of the continent. This cape, of which the projecting rocks seem to pierce into the clouds, was then clad in all its horrors. It was the season of winter, and the ocean was prodigiously tempestuous. The ships of the Portuguese were shattered with a long voyage, and it was deemed utterly impossible in that condition to double the Cabo Tormentoso, or the Cape of Storms. They returned, however, after a voyage of sixteen months, firmly persuaded that they had ascertained the limits of Africa, and that by doubling that cape, which they might expect to perform in a more moderate season, they should find a new and easy passage to

India, and thus engross to themselves a commerce which could not fail to be an inexhaustible source of wealth and power.

The promontory was now termed the Cape of Good Hope; and a strong armament was prepared for this new adventure, which presented such flattering prospects to the ambition of the Portuguese. It was in this very interval of time that Columbus the Genoese, instigated by a similar spirit of adventurous ambition, discovered the islands of Cuba and Hispaniola, and soon after, the great continent of America; but of this important discovery we shall afterwards particularly treat.

In the year 1479, the Portuguese fleet under Vasco de Gama doubled the Cape of Good Hope. Hitherto everything bore an appearance of novelty,—a new race of men, black and barbarous, languages totally unknown, and no traces of resemblance to the European manners. Sailing onwards they were delighted to perceive at once the Arabian tongue, and to find a race of men who professed the religion of Mahomet. They now found that they had almost circumnavigated the continent of Africa, and that this immense peninsula was connected with Asia by the narrow isthmus of Suez. At length, by the aid of Mahometan pilots, passing the mouths of the Arabian and Persian Gulfs, and stretching along the western coast of India, De Gama arrived at Calicut, on the coast of Malabar, after a voyage of 1500 leagues, performed in thirteen months.

Calicut was at that time a city of great

wealth and splendour, the residence of one of those *rajahs**, or petty sovereigns, who then occupied the greatest part of Indostan, and were chiefly tributaries to the Mogul emperors. De Gama formed an alliance with the Rajah of Calicut, and returned to Lisbon with some specimens of the wealth and produce of the country. A fleet of thirteen ships was now fitted out with all despatch, and these, performing the voyage with equal good fortune, began to make settlements upon the coast. They found opposition from some of the petty princes, which obliged them to have recourse to arms; and a war once begun was not finished till the Portuguese had achieved the conquest of all the coast of Malabar.

The court of Lisbon now appointed as viceroy or governor of the country, Alphonso de Albuquerque, a man of great spirit and resolution. The city of Goa, which belonged to the Rajah of the Deccan, was taken by storm, and became now the residence of the Portuguese viceroy, and the capital of all their settlements in India.

While such was the state of affairs in the East, the Venetians, who had hitherto engrossed the whole trade from India, by means of the Red Sea and the port of Alexandria, soon perceived that this most lucrative commerce was on the point of annihilation, and that every advantage of the Indian trade must now be transferred to the Portuguese. Various expedients were thought

* *Rajah* is evidently from the same original root with the Latin Rex—*Regis:* but this is only one of a thousand such coincidences.

of to obviate these impending misfortunes. It was the interest of the Sultan of Egypt to concur with the Venetians in support of a trade from which he as well as they had derived great benefits. A plan was meditated for some time of cutting through the Isthmus of Suez, and thus joining the Mediterranean and the Red Sea; but the Egyptians were apprehensive that their low and flat country might be drowned altogether in this attempt, and therefore the project was abandoned. It was now proposed that an immense fleet should be equipped on the Red Sea, which should lie in wait for the Portuguese at the mouth of the Gulf, and destroy them on their passage to India. The Sultan of Egypt had no wood to build a fleet, but the Venetians sent him the whole materials from Italy to Alexandria, from whence they were transported, with great difficulty and at an immense expense, overland to Suez. Here a fleet was immediately constructed. But Albuquerque, who was aware of the schemes of the confederate powers, had prepared a force sufficient to baffle all their designs. The armaments which came from Egypt, instead of attacking, were obliged to act on the defensive, and were always beaten by the Portuguese squadrons.

Thus the Venetians found themselves excluded from all intercourse with India by the Red Sea; and as the Persian Gulf, though not so commodious, might still have allowed them some communication with the East, the Portuguese could not rest satisfied till they had deprived them of that likewise. The fleet of Albuquerque

entered the Gulf, and ravaging all the coasts, concluded by the taking of Ormuz, which, lying at the mouth of the straits, commands the whole sea.

After this expedition, the Portuguese, finding their power firmly established both in the Arabian and Persian Gulfs, began to extend their conquests in the eastern parts of Asia. They took the island of Ceylon, where there is the richest pearl-fishery in the world; made a settlement in Bengal; and sailing eastward, attacked and conquered Malacca, and received a voluntary submission from the kings of Pegu and Siam. Meeting with some Chinese merchants at Malacca, they were prompted to steer their course to China, a country then scarcely at all known to the Europeans. A Venetian, of the name of Marco Polo, had indeed travelled thither by land, about the end of the thirteenth century, and had brought to Europe some vague accounts of that empire, which were so extraordinary as to be regarded as entirely fabulous. Albuquerque, however, having transmitted to Portugal a relation of his voyage thither, and his opinion of the advantage of forming a connexion with this remarkable people, a squadron was sent from Lisbon to convey an ambassador to China, in the year 1518. The Portuguese belonging to this fleet were fortunate enough to recommend themselves to the favour of the emperor, by extirpating some pirates who committed depredations on the coasts. In reward of this service the emperor allowed them to build a settlement at Macao, which very soon became

a flourishing city, and opened a commerce for them both with China and with the neighbouring islands of Japan.

It is astonishing with what rapidity the Portuguese had made these discoveries and conquests. In less than fifty years they became masters of the whole trade of the Eastern ocean.

Let us now observe the effects of these discoveries, and the consequences of this new route to India, explored by the Portuguese, upon the commerce of Europe.

The Portuguese were very soon possessed of all the Spice Islands, and it is computed that their produce alone brought to Lisbon annually above 200,000 ducats. As the spice trade had been for some centuries the exclusive property of the Venetians, the loss of it was a blow which they never recovered. After all the attempts which we have seen made to oppose the Portuguese, they made a last effort to retain still somewhat of its benefits, by making a proposal to the court of Lisbon to become the sole purchasers of all the spice annually imported thither, over and above what Portugal itself could consume; but this proposal was contemptuously rejected. Some writers have expressed their admiration that a state so powerful as Venice certainly was at this time did not fit out her own fleets from the Mediterranean, and, pursuing the same route to the Eastern coast, attempt to colonise and to conquer, as well as the Portuguese, and thus indemnify themselves, in some measure, for what they had lost. But, in the first place, they were obliged, in those times, to be con-

stantly watchful of the growing power of the Turks, who were making daily encroachments on their possessions in the Levant. At this very time, too, the formidable league of Cambray, as we have seen, seemed to threaten them at home with total destruction; but even when in a state of peace they were in no capacity to vie with the Portuguese in this trade by the Cape of Good Hope. The situation of the latter gave them every advantage. The Venetians, besides a much longer navigation, must have been perpetually exposed to the corsairs of Barbary, who then infested the mouth of the Mediterranean.

But though one state suffered remarkably by this great revolution in the trade of India, the effect was, in general, beneficial to the European kingdoms. Commercial industry was roused in every quarter, and not only foreign trade, but domestic manufactures, made a most rapid progress. In the course of the fifteenth century, France, which hitherto had manifested very little of the spirit of commerce, began to be remarkably distinguished for its trade and manufactures. The towns of Lyons, Tours, and Abbeville, and the ports of Marseilles and Bordeaux, now rivalled the most eminent commercial cities of Europe; and Antwerp and Amsterdam became the great marts of the north. Bruges, which we have seen hitherto the entrepôt between the Hanseatic merchants and those of Italy, began now to be on the decline. It revolted against its prince in the year 1480, and the disorders, occasioned by civil commotions were extremely hurtful to its trade. The declension of Bruges

was the commencement of the splendour of Antwerp and Amsterdam; but Antwerp had the superiority. The immunities and liberty of consicence enjoyed there induced, at the era of the Reformation, a number of French and German protestants to establish themselves in it. The city was computed at this time to contain above 100,000 inhabitants. The merchants of Bruges, too, resorted thither on the decline of its trade. The sovereigns of the Netherlands likewise had established there fairs for commerce, free of all tolls or customs. These fairs, of which there were two in the year, lasted for six weeks at a time, and were frequented by merchants from every quarter of Europe. After the establishment of this general commercial intercourse, the Portuguese found Antwerp a most convenient entrepôt for transmitting the spices and productions of India, for the supply of the northern kingdoms; and this became an additional and very considerable source of its wealth.

Thus the trade of Antwerp exceeded, for some time, that of all the north of Europe, till Philip II., king of Spain, as we shall afterwards see, by the impolitic restrictions and taxes he imposed—and, above all, by restraints on religion and the establishment of the tribunal of the Inquisition—excited the revolt of the Netherlands, and lost seven provinces, which uniting into a republic, maintained a respectable independence from that time till the convulsions caused by the *French Revolution*; and by the most vigorous and unremitting industry carried

commerce to its utmost height. The Spaniards took Antwerp in the year 1584, and blocked up and destroyed the navigation of the River Scheldt, imagining that they would thus transfer the commerce of that city to some of the other towns of Austrian Flanders, which had continued in their allegiance; but this policy hurt themselves, and turned entirely to the advantage of their enemies, for the trade of Holland, and particularly that of Amsterdam, rose upon the ruins of that of Antwerp. Amsterdam was, even before this time, pretty considerable as a commercial town. The decline of the Hanse towns had transferred thither a great part of the trade of the north. The Hanseatic confederacy had begun to decline from the year 1428. Jealousy had pervaded the different states, and many of them withdrew themselves from the league. Amsterdam profited by this decline of commerce on the Baltic; and upon the demolition of Antwerp became, as we have already said, the greatest commercial city of the north. Inhabiting a country gained almost entirely from the sea, and extremely unfruitful, the Dutch urged by necessity, by the means of trade alone, and domestic manufactures, attained to a very high degree of wealth and splendour. The country of Holland does not produce what is sufficient to maintain the hundredth part of its inhabitants. The Dutch have no timber nor maritime stores, no coals, no metal, yet their commerce furnished them with every thing. Their granaries were full of corn, even when the harvest failed in the most fertile countries; their naval stores were most abundant, and the popu-

lousness of this country, which, in reality, is but a bank of barren sand, exceeded prodigiously that of the most fruitful and most cultivated of the European kingdoms.

The effects of the Portuguese discoveries in diffusing the spirit of commercial industry being thus extensively felt over Europe, it is not to be doubted that the commerce of Britain was likewise sensibly affected; though it is not, perhaps, possible to trace distinctly to that source the increase of the British trade, which was very conspicuous at that period in the growth and enlargement of our domestic manufactures. It is easier to perceive the effect of another cause, which operated at this time most powerfully in several of the European countries, and particularly in Britain. This was the Reformation. The suppression of the convents in Britain, in the reign of Henry VIII., restoring to society many thousands who were formerly dead to every purpose of public utility, and the cutting off all papal exactions, which were a very great drain to the wealth of the kingdom, were obvious consequences of this great revolution of opinions.

Henry VIII. encouraged domestic manufactures by many excellent laws, and the woollen trade, in particular, arose during his reign to a very great height*. It is worthy of notice, that

* Henry VIII., confined the woollen manufactures to particular towns. In the infancy of manufactures, monopolies act beneficially, by drawing capital and skill to a particular focus, and thus concentrating their operation. That nursing is useful, nay necessary, in childhood, which becomes useless and injurious in maturity.

in this reign, likewise, the interest of money was first fixed by law in England. While this continued an arbitrary matter—that is to say, while the prohibitions of the canon law were in full force, which, as we formerly remarked, condemned all interest as illegal and contrary to the express command of scripture—its exaction, being kept secret, was beyond measure exorbitant. Twenty and thirty per cent. were, in the fourteenth century, accounted a moderate rate of usance. Henry VIII., by a statute passed in the year 1546, for the punishment of usury, limited the legal interest to ten per cent., at which rate it continued till after the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

The prodigious increase of the commerce of England since the days of Henry VIII. may be estimated from this particular. The whole rental of England in lands and houses did not then exceed five millions per annum; it was assessed to the property tax in 1815, at 49,744,622*l.* sterling *. It is not to be denied that it is to our commerce we owe our domestic manufactures, the increase and variety of our produce, the improvement of our lands, the rise of their value, and consequently the increase of the real wealth of the nation. It is commercial industry that not only doubles the produce of our coun-

* Annual value of real property as assessed to the property tax, 1815 :—

England . . .	£49,744,622
Wales	2,154,000
Scotland . . .	6,653,000
	£58,551,622

try, but doubles, trebles, and quadruples the value of that produce. As for example:—the unmanufactured wool of England, of one year's growth, has been computed to be worth six millions sterling; when manufactured, it is supposed to be worth eighteen millions. In former times we have seen that this wool was exported to be manufactured, and, consequently, that foreigners reaped the greatest part of the profit of this prodigious increase on its value, while our own people remained inactive and unemployed.

Every other manufacture, as well as that of wool, has within these two last centuries prodigiously increased in Britain; and in fact, this island may now be said to be the workshop of the world. In the reign of Henry VIII., and even in the golden reign of Elizabeth, our manufactures were chiefly managed by foreigners, among whom alone the necessary skill was to be found. They now give employment to more millions of British subjects than constituted the whole population of these islands even so late as the beginning of the eighteenth century. To the advancement of our manufactures is to be ascribed the prodigious increase of our population since the commencement of that century—for, although, in the agricultural districts of the kingdom, we observe also a steady and progressive increase of the number of inhabitants—it is in those districts which have become the seat of manufactures, that we find that prodigious increase to have taken place which has

swelled the population of England and Wales to the present enormous amount*.

* This may be well illustrated by a comparison of the increase of population in the two counties of Norfolk and Lancashire—the former, that in which the greatest progress has been made in agriculture—the latter, that in which the advancement of manufactures has been the most remarkable. In point of superficial extent these counties are nearly equal, each being about one thirtieth part of all England. In the year 1700, the population of Norfolk considerably exceeded that of Lancashire, the former being about 210,000, the latter about 166,000. In 1831, the population of Norfolk was 390,000—thus less than doubled; while the population of Lancashire had risen to 1,335,800, or multiplied somewhat more than eight-fold. This enormous increase of the population of this county may be dated from a much later period viz., the year 1767, the date of the invention of the *spinning jenny*—or perhaps, more properly, from the year 1781; for, previous to this time, the cotton manufacture of Lancashire was of a domestic nature; those overgrown masses of moral corruption, the crowded manufactories, were unknown; and that noble race of men, the yeomanry of England, still flourished in that county, where now scarcely a trace of them is to be found.

How far this enormous growth of one member is consistent with the wholesome state of the body politic—and to what it will ultimately tend—are, perhaps, the gravest questions in the whole circle of political inquiry.

The reciprocal dependence, which exists between the agricultural and manufacturing prosperity of a kingdom, is a subject of too deep importance to be safely left by the statesman either to the speculations of the political theorist, or to the narrow and short-sighted views engendered by peculiar interests. The tendency of the *political economists* of the present day is to deny the importance of agriculture to a state; and to maintain, that any inadequacy in the food of the people can be best and most cheaply supplied by commerce;—that the application of capital and industry to increase the productiveness of the soil is altogether *unphilosophical;*

their *proper* application being to the extension of manufactures, with which the food of the people can be obtained at less expense from foreigners. So says Mr. Macculloch now, and so said Sir Walter Raleigh in the days of Elizabeth. The political sophist of the present day preaches the abandonment of all the inferior lands of England. His illustrious predecessor argued in like manner: "Do not waste money in draining Romney marsh and the fens of Lincolnshire; they produce more value in reeds and sedges than they will ever do in corn; and you can buy corn cheaper than you can raise it." If the argument be good for any thing now, it was equally true in the days of Elizabeth, and the modern political economist must in consistency lament, that in those early days Lord Bacon should have lent his powerful mind to arrest the prosperity of his country. But how would the case stand now, had the counsels of Sir Walter Raleigh become the fashionable political economy of the succeeding reigns? The marsh lands of Kent, which he would have condemned to the production of reeds and sedges, amount to 82,000 acres of the finest land in England—those of Lincolnshire, equal, or perhaps, superior in productiveness, to 473,000 acres. Stating their produce at three quarters of wheat per acre, (thus, on such land, allowing for the inferior value of intermediate crops,) they would yield 1,665,000 quarters, being three times the average amount of all the wheat imported annually into Great Britain for the last thirty years.

The wealds of Kent, Surrey, and Sussex contain nearly 1000 square miles, described in the Saxon Chronicles as a wild, unprofitable waste, covered with heath and rushes, which the application of capital and industry has now converted into one of the most beautiful and fertile districts of England. The whole county of Norfolk, in like manner, is the most artificial soil in England. It is little more than one hundred years since half the county was a rabbit warren, and the greater part of the remainder a poor thin clay. It is now the most uniform in productiveness of any county in England, exporting grain to the value of 1,000,000*l.* sterling; yet is it essentially a very poor soil, which any suspension of the culture bestowed on it would, in a very few years, cast back to its original sterility. And to this the political economists of

the present day would consign it; for it corresponds precisely to No. 6 of Mr. Macculloch's scale. Had this theory been acted on for the last three centuries, where would have been the home market for British manufactures? or rather what would British manufactures have been?—[EDITOR, 1834.]

CHAPTER XIX.

Charles V. succeeds to the Throne of Spain—Elected Emperor of Germany—Contests with Francis I.—Alliance with Henry VIII.—The Constable of Bourbon takes Francis I. prisoner—Treaty of Madrid—Henry VIII. takes part with Francis—Charles defeats the Turks in Hungary—Defeats Barbarossa in Africa—Francis allies himself with the Turks—War carried on in Italy and France—Death of Francis I.—Rise and History of the Order of Jesuits—Ferdinand of Saxony Head of the Protestant League—Resignation of Charles V.—The Constitution of the German empire.

We are now arrived at an era which is distinguished by some of the most remarkable events in the history of mankind:—the aggrandisement of the house of Austria, by the elevation of Charles V. to the imperial throne — a display of the greatest schemes of policy and ambition—the reformation of the Christian religion from the errors of the church of Rome—and the discovery of the Western World. But these interesting subjects demand a separate and an attentive consideration. We begin with a brief delineation of the most remarkable events of the reign of the emperor Charles V.

From the time of the emperor Sigismund, and the memorable transactions that attended the Council of the Church which was assembled at

Constance by this emperor—where he enjoyed the proud triumph of degrading three rival popes, and placing a fourth upon the papal chair—the empire of Germany, which was governed for two years with spirit and ability by his son-in-law, Albert II., enjoyed a state of languid tranquillity during the long reign of his successor, Frederic III., surnamed the Peaceable, which was of fifty-three years' duration. The only circumstance that renders this reign at all worthy of notice was the marriage of his eldest son Maximilian with Mary, duchess of Burgundy, who brought, as her dowry, the sovereignty of the Netherlands; which, from that time, with the exception of those provinces that revolted, and formed themselves into the Republic of Holland, have continued, till of late, to be part of the patrimonial dominions of the house of Austria. Maximilian, after the death of his father, was elected emperor in the year 1493. This prince, who was an able politician, laid the foundation of the permanent greatness of the German empire, by procuring the enactment of that celebrated constitutional law, which establishes a perpetual peace between the whole of the states composing the Germanic body, and which, before that time, had been at constant variance upon every trivial opposition of interests. Thenceforth, every such contest was to be treated as an act of *rebellion against the empire*. It is easy to see of what vast importance this law was to the solid interests of the Germanic body.

Maximilian had one son, who died before

himself, Philip, hereditary lord of the Netherlands, who, marrying Jane, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, acquired the succession to the whole kingdom of Spain as her fortune. He died, however, before this succession opened to his family, which was destined to be the patrimonial crown of his eldest son, the celebrated Charles V.

Charles V. was born at Ghent, in the year 1500. He was endowed by nature with a very extensive genius: he possessed acuteness of talents, indefatigable activity, and unbounded ambition; but his policy was of that crafty nature which is inconsistent with real greatness of soul.

He succeeded to the throne of Spain in the year 1516, upon the death of Ferdinand, his maternal grandfather, and was obliged to struggle with great disorders in that monarchy, which had their origin in the antipathy which the Spaniards conceived against their new sovereigns of the house of Austria. A rebellion actually arose upon this account, which was of several years' duration. It was at length happily quelled; and Charles, at peace in his hereditary dominions, preferred his claim to the German empire upon the death of his grandfather, the emperor Maximilian. He had a formidable rival and competitor for that dignity in Francis I., king of France, a monarch five years older than himself, who had already distinguished himself in Italy by the conquest of the Milanese, in which war he had defeated the army of pope Leo and of the Swiss in the battle of Marignan.

Francis, however, from being the enemy, became soon after the ally of pope Leo X., and of the Swiss. He had compelled the emperor Maximilian to restore the territory of Verona to the Venetians, and procured for Leo the duchy of Urbino. Thus the king of France, at the age of twenty-five, was considered as the umpire of Italy, and the most powerful prince in Europe.

The claims of these illustrious competitors for the German empire were, then, very nearly balanced; but the electors, apprehensive for their own liberties, under the government of either of those great monarchs, determined to reject both the candidates, and made offer of the imperial crown to Frederic, duke of Saxony. This prince, however, undazzled by the splendour of so high an object of ambition, rejected the proffered sovereignty with a magnanimity no less singular than great, and strongly urging the policy of preferring the Spanish monarch, procured the election of Charles of Spain.

The two candidates had hitherto conducted their rivalship without enmity, and even with a show of friendship. Francis declared, with his usual vivacity, "that his brother Charles and he were fairly and openly suitors to the same mistress. The most assiduous and fortunate will succeed; and the other," said he, "must rest contented." No sooner, however, was the contest decided, than he found himself unable to practise that moderation he had promised, and which was, indeed, too much for human nature. He could not suppress his indignation at being foiled in the competition, in the face of all Eu-

rope, by a youth yet unknown to fame. The spirit of Charles resented this contempt, and from this jealousy, as much as from opposition of interests, arose that emulation between those two great monarchs, which involved them in perpetual hostilities, and kept the greatest part of Europe in commotion.

Charles and Francis had many mutual claims upon each other's dominions. Charles claimed Artois, as sovereign of the Netherlands. Francis prepared to make good his pretensions to Naples and Sicily. Charles had, as Emperor, to defend the duchy of Milan; and, as king of Spain, to support his title to Navarre, which his grandfather, Ferdinand, had wrested from the dominion of France. In short, nature, or rather fortune, seemed to have decreed that these two princes should be perpetually at war with each other.

Henry VIII. of England had power enough to have held the balance; as the contest at first between these rival princes was so equal, that the weight of England on either side must have given a decided superiority, and entirely overpowered the single party. But Henry, though he had ambition, had not judgment to direct his conduct, which seems to have been influenced solely by the caprice of his own disposition, when he was not absolutely led, as was frequently the case, by his ministers. He was at this time governed by Thomas Wolsey, a man whom he had raised from an obscure station to the dignity of archbishop of York, and chancellor of England, and whom the pope had made a cardinal, and

his legate in England. The counsels and the measures of Wolsey had less in view the interests of the nation than his own greatness and unmeasurable ambition. Wolsey, it is plain, could take no side in directing the part to be chosen by Henry between the rival princes, unless what was agreeable to his master, Leo X.; and the fact was, that Leo was as much in doubt what part to take as any of them. Henry, however, was courted by both the rivals, and had address enough, for some time, to flatter each with the prospect of his friendship. Francis contrived to have an interview with him at Calais, where the only object seemed to be an ostentatious display of the magnificence of the two sovereigns. Charles, who had more art, went himself in person to England to pay his court, and Henry, flattered by this condescension of the emperor, conducted him back to Gravelines, and gave him the strongest grounds to hope for an alliance between them.

A great party of the Spaniards, dissatisfied with the absence of their sovereign, broke out into rebellion; and Francis, judging this a favourable opportunity for the recovery of Navarre, invaded that province, and made an entire conquest of it: but the French, elated with this success, imprudently made an attack likewise upon the kingdom of Castile, which united the Spaniards against them, and they were driven out of Navarre almost as soon as they had got possession of it. The emperor, in the mean while, attacked France on the quarter of Picardy; and the French, at the same time, were beaten out of the

Milanese and Genoa, a misfortune which was chiefly owing to Francis's own extravagance and want of economy. The Swiss troops in his service had deserted for want of pay.

At this juncture died Leo X.; and Charles, that he might have a pope securely in his interest, and one whom he could absolutely manage, caused the triple diadem to be given to his former preceptor, cardinal Adrian. Cardinal Wolsey had expected the papal dignity, but the emperor found means to soothe him with the hopes of soon succeeding Adrian, who was far advanced in life. The policy of Charles appeared now in its utmost extent. The pope was his dependent, Wolsey was his friend, and Henry, of course, was at length induced to declare himself his ally, and to proclaim war against France, under the delusive idea of recovering the former possessions of the English in that kingdom.

A most formidable combination seemed now ready to overwhelm Francis I., under which a monarch of less spirit and abilities than himself must certainly have succumbed at once. The pope, the emperor, the king of England, the archduke Ferdinand — to whom his brother, Charles V., had ceded the German dominions of the house of Austria—were all united against the king of France.

Francis had formerly owed to the great military abilities of the Constable of Bourbon the signal victory of Marignan, and the conquest of the Milanese. It was the misfortune and the imprudence of the French monarch to quarrel with

this useful subject, at the very time when he most needed his assistance.

An iniquitous decree of the parliament of Paris, by which the Constable was deprived of the whole estates belonging to the family of Bourbon, was the cause of an irreconcilable animosity, and of a firm purpose of vengeance now meditated by the Constable against the king of France. He immediately offered his services to the emperor; and, like another Coriolanus, with equal valour and ability, and with equal infamy, became the determined enemy of his country. The emperor received him, as may be believed, with open arms; but in the breast of every worthy man his conduct excited that detestation which it merited. Even the Spanish officers themselves abhorred his perfidy. "If the Constable of Bourbon," said one of these generals, "should enter my house, I would burn it after his departure, as a place polluted by treason and perfidy." But Charles V. saw this acquisition through the medium of his own interest, and created the Constable generalissimo of his armies.

Too much confidence seems to have been the great error of Francis I. While the troops of the emperor were commanded in Italy by Bourbon, by Pescara, and John de' Medicis, all of them generals of consummate ability, they were opposed by the admiral Bonnivet, a man of very moderate talents, with a very inconsiderable army. The French were defeated at Biagrassa, where the most remarkable circumstance was the death of the illustrious Chevalier Bayard, who had distinguished himself not only by his

great military prowess, but by a life regulated by the maxims of the strictest honour, and the most romantic generosity. He was termed by his contemporaries, in the language of chivalry, the *Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*. In his last moments, while the Constable of Bourbon, standing by his side, was lamenting his fate, "It is not *I*," said he, "who am an object of commiseration; it is *you*, who are fighting against your king, your country, and your oaths."

The troops of the emperor, under this illustrious renegade, were carrying every thing before them, when Francis himself hastened into Italy, entered the territory of Milan, and, without difficulty, retook the city; but the imprudent Bonnivet thought proper to besiege Pavia, while a great part of the French army had been detached against the kingdom of Navarre. In this divided situation, the imperial troops, infinitely superior in numbers, and most ably commanded, presented themselves in order of battle. Francis disdaining to retreat, a desperate engagement ensued, in which the French army was entirely cut to pieces, and the King himself (whose life was saved by a French officer in the imperial army) was made the Constable of Bourbon's prisoner.

It is, perhaps, the only impeachment against the political talents of Charles V., that he neglected upon this occasion to improve his good fortune. Instead of marching into France and prosecuting his successes with all the advantage which the captivity of the monarch gave him in his designs upon the kingdom, he chose

rather to obtain by treaty and stipulation what he ought to have gained by force of arms. He brought Francis to Madrid—where his resolute spirit declared at first his intention to die in prison, before he would consent to yield any part or dismember his dominions. At length disease and the miseries of confinement got the better of his magnanimity, and he consented to sign the treaty of Madrid, by which he yielded to Charles the duchy of Burgundy, and the empty superiority of Flanders and Artois; and put his two sons into the hands of the emperor as hostages for the performance of these conditions. Scarcely, however, was he at liberty when he formed a league with the pope, who absolved him from his oaths. The states of Burgundy had published a solemn declaration that no king could dispose of their freedom or sell them like slaves: and on these grounds Francis refused to perform the treaty or return to his imprisonment, and Charles consented to ransom his two sons and give up Burgundy for a large sum of money. Thus from these signal events, the battle of Pavia and the captivity of the king of France, the emperor drew no solid advantage whatever. On the contrary, Francis soon found his situation more promising than before, for Henry VIII., till now the ally of Charles, had become jealous of the emperor's increasing greatness, and finding himself less courted as his aid was less needed, determined to throw his influence into the scale of the king of France.

The treaty of Madrid, disregarded from the beginning, was now interrupted by a formal

declaration of war on the part of Henry and Francis. Charles in the meantime had lost an opportunity of obtaining the sovereignty of Italy. The Constable of Bourbon had defeated the papal army in the interest of Francis, had taken the city of Rome, and made Pope Clement VII. his prisoner. But Bourbon himself was killed in the siege; and Charles again lost his advantages. His avarice got the better of his policy, and he set the pope at liberty, as he had done the princes of France, for a large sum of money. Some apology may perhaps be found for Charles in the great variety of important concerns to which he had now to attend—the beginning commotions excited by the reformation in Germany, the operations of the Turks in Hungary, the different political views of the Italian states, and the formidable alliance between France and England. Perhaps it was not in this situation possible to push to the utmost any partial advantage.

Charles had concluded the peace of Cambray which set Francis at liberty, and ceded Burgundy, when he set out from Spain to receive the imperial diadem from the hands of the pope. In Italy he assumed the authority of an absolute sovereign. He granted to Francis Sforza the investiture of the Milanese, and to Alexander of Medicis that of Tuscany; and he made the pope restore Modena and Reggio to the duke of Ferrara.

The depredations of the Turks called him into Hungary. It was here that, for the first time, he appeared at the head of his armies; having

hitherto fought only by his generals; a circumstance which has been said to mark the character of Charles V. as having been rather that of a politician than a warrior *. He had the glory of compelling Soliman, with an army, as is said, of no less than 300,000 men, to retire before him and to evacuate the country. This enterprise was succeeded by another still more illustrious. Hayradin Barbarossa, who had been at first a common corsair, seized upon the city of Algiers, and by treachery and violence had dethroned Muley Hassan and usurped the kingdom of Tunis. The dethroned prince applied to the emperor for support, and Charles, ambitious of every opportunity of acquiring glory, embarked immediately for the coast of Africa, with a fleet of five hundred sail and 30,000 men. Barbarossa met him with an army amounting to 50,000. The imperial troops were victorious. Muley Hassan was restored on condition of paying a tribute to the Spanish crown; and 10,000 Christian captives, who had been detained in bondage at Tunis, were instantly set at liberty and returned with the conqueror to Spain. At this time, Charles V. surpassed in reputation all the princes of Europe. No potentate since the days of Charlemagne possessed equal abilities with an equal extent of empire: and if we consider what was the state of this empire, how rich,

* While the spirit of chivalry prevailed in Europe, kings generally headed their armies in person: but this was sometimes attended with very fatal consequences, for the death or captivity of a sovereign often brought his kingdom to the brink of ruin.

how flourishing, and how populous, we may regard Charles, in his political capacity, as the greatest monarch that had ever existed in Europe.

It was a mean piece of conduct in Francis—yet perhaps his situation made it his best policy—to call in the aid of Soliman and the Turks, to dispossess Charles of the duchy of Milan. It was concerted that the Turks should attack the kingdom of Naples and Hungary, while a French army invaded the Milanese. Barbarossa landed near Tarento, and spread a dreadful alarm through the whole country. But as the French army were not quick enough to co-operate with him, the project miscarried, and the Turks were obliged to withdraw and re-embark their troops. The French army in the mean time had passed the Alps, when Charles V. set out from Rome, obliged them again to retreat across the mountains, and entering Provence, advanced as far as Marseilles, and laid siege to Arles, while another army ravaged Champagne and Picardy. It was on this occasion of the enterprise against the Milanese, that Francis took it into his head to send Charles a challenge to engage him in single combat; staking as a prize Milan on the one part, and Burgundy on the other. The challenge was accepted, but it may be believed that this extraordinary duel was never fought. A short time after, Francis summoned the emperor to appear before the French parliament and defend himself for having violated the treaty of Cambray. The most ridiculous part of this farce was, that Charles, having failed to appear, was actually sentenced by the parliament of

Paris—and the counties of Artois and Flanders were declared confiscated to the crown of France. In consequence of this absurd procedure, Francis actually took possession of some of the towns in Flanders; but both parties were now desirous of an accommodation, and a truce for ten years was entered into at Nice, by which it was agreed that, till the conclusion of a peace, matters should remain in their then existing situation.

An insurrection happening at this time in the city of Ghent on occasion of a demand of subsidies from the Flemish nobles, the emperor was desirous of making a progress to his dominions in the Netherlands. He asked permission of Francis to pass through the kingdom of France, and promised to grant him the investiture of Milan, which seemed all along to have been the highest object of Francis's ambition. The request was cheerfully complied with. Charles, with an hundred attendants, travelled through the dominions of his rival, who gave orders that he should be everywhere received with all possible marks of magnificent hospitality, and entertained him himself with great pomp during seven days that he stayed in the city of Paris: but Charles, having obtained his purpose, and reduced the rebels of Ghent to submission, thought no more of the promise regarding the Milanese. He left all Europe to make their remarks on the altered appearance which he and his rival now mutually presented to the world—in a word, on the king of France's generous credulity and his own breach of faith. This was sufficient cause

for the dissolution of the late treaty of Nice, and accordingly hostilities recommenced with greater animosity than ever. Francis forthwith renewed his alliance with Soliman, and his fleet under the Count D'Enguien, joined with that of the Turks, made an unsuccessful attempt on the town of Nice.

The French were more fortunate in Italy, where they obtained a most complete victory over the Marquis del Vasto, at Cerisoles; but this, like most of their victories in Italy, produced no lasting consequence of any advantage. Francis, meantime, continued to be harassed in his own dominions both by the emperor and by the king of England, who laid siege to Boulogne by sea, while Charles advanced into Picardy; and under these circumstances it was not to be expected that the success of the French in Italy could be of any advantage. France in fact seemed now in the utmost danger; and she owed her preservation to the troubles in Germany, which required the emperor's presence to appease them. The reformation was going on there with great spirit. The protestant party were united against Charles, and this circumstance, extremely fortunate for France, obliged the emperor to conclude the treaty of Crepi with Francis I., who, at the same time, purchased a peace with Henry VIII. for 200,000*l.* sterling. This was the last public event which signalised the reign of Francis I., a prince of a manly and heroic spirit, endowed with abilities sufficient to have made his name illustrious and his country great and happy, had it not been

his misfortune to struggle, during the greatest part of his reign, against the superior power and greater political abilities of Charles V. Francis died of that distemper which the discovery of the New World had imported into Europe, and which in those days, from the ignorance of any method of cure, was commonly mortal.

About this time was founded the famous order of the Jesuits, a body whose influence, for two centuries, was much greater in Europe than that of any other religious society, and had its operation in some shape or other on most of the political transactions during a long period of time. The founder of this order was an ambitious enthusiast of the name of Ignatius Loyola. He rightly conceived that, in this period, when the papal authority had received a severe shock, by the defection and apostacy of so many nations from the catholic faith, a body of men who should enlist themselves as the professed and devoted servants of the pope, and hold themselves constantly in readiness to execute with fidelity, at all times and in all places, whatever he should enjoin them, would so recommend themselves to his favour as soon to obtain the pre-eminence over every other religious association. The Jesuits, therefore, to the three vows of poverty, chastity, and monastic obedience, added a fourth, which was, implicit devotion to the pope. The manifest utility of this institution to the support of the holy see, procured them from Pope Paul III. an apostolic bull, granting them the most ample privileges. It was soon perceived, that if confined to their

cloisters, their utility would be too much circumscribed. They were allowed to mingle in the world, and to take a share in all the active concerns of public life, which it was their duty to influence and direct assiduously towards the great end of establishing the power and authority of the popedom; and this end, it must be owned, they most zealously promoted. Under the command of a superior, or general of the order, whose instructions they were bound to receive with implicit submission, they dispersed themselves over the greatest part of the globe. By the most insinuating arts they courted the favour and wrought themselves into the confidence of statesmen, of civil and ecclesiastical governors, and of sovereign princes; and operating on all to the same purpose, and regularly communicating their intelligence to their head, from whom they received their instructions, the whole catholic world was in a manner directed by one great and pervading system of policy, which centred in the establishment of the pope's supreme temporal and spiritual jurisdiction*. The zeal of this

* It has been noticed by M. Duclos, (in his Voyage en Italie,) as a remarkable fact, that, notwithstanding the great power and influence of this religious association, none of its members ever arrived at the papal dignity. The reasons which he assigns are these:—the jealousy of the cardinals, who dreaded that very power and influence, as conceiving the Jesuits might monopolise that high dignity to their own order; but still more, the deeper policy of the Jesuits themselves, who considered the papal dignity as not the object but only the instrument of their ambition, which aspired at the government of all the kingdoms of Europe, and the popedom among the rest.

order, and the capacity of its members, while thus promoting the great purpose of its institution, could not fail of attaining both immense wealth and great power. As these increased, this society found enemies in all whose authority they undermined, and whose aims they traversed. Books were written without number to expose their artifice and ambition. Their frauds, their vices, and even atrocious crimes, were loudly proclaimed; and it was urged, with great reason, that the doctrines which they taught, and the maxims they inculcated, were equally pernicious to religion, to civil government, and to all the interests of society. The sovereigns of the different catholic kingdoms, by degrees, began to perceive that their power and even personal security was in danger, and the Jesuits were successively expelled from France, from Spain, from Portugal and from Sicily; and such at length was the influence of the house of Bourbon with the holy see, that the order was entirely suppressed and abolished in 1773.

The life of Charles V. was a scene of constant turmoil and agitation. His aim, it is said, was universal empire; but at the death of Francis, his most formidable rival, he found himself at as great a distance as ever from the object of his wishes. The protestants of Germany entered into a most formidable confederacy in support of their religious liberties, and the joint forces of

But this was a government which was to be silently exercised, and which an open assumption of power would have altogether destroyed.

Charles, of his brother Ferdinand, king of Hungary and Bohemia, and of Pope Paul III., whom he was forced to call in to his aid, were scarcely sufficient to oppose them. He defeated them, it is true, in the battle of Mulberg, but the party was neither broken nor dispirited, and through the remainder of the life of Charles continued to give him perpetual vexation. The party of the protestants was headed at this time by one of the greatest characters of the age, Frederic Duke of Saxony; the same man whose high reputation, as we have before observed, would have procured him the election to the Germanic empire, even against such candidates as Charles V. and Francis I., had not his own modesty expressly declined that elevated station. It is but justice to this most respectable man to relate an anecdote, told by Roger Ascham, preceptor to Queen Elizabeth, who, when in Germany, was personally acquainted with him. Duke Frederic was taken prisoner by Charles V. in the battle of Mulberg, and, upon a representation of some of his counsellors, that the exemplary punishment of so eminent a man would prove of great service in checking the progress of the Reformation, the emperor, forgetting his own obligations to him, condemned him to be beheaded on a scaffold at Wittemberg. The warrant for his execution, signed by the emperor's hand, was sent to Duke Frederic the night before, and was delivered to him while he was playing at chess with his cousin the landgrave of Lithenberg. He read it over attentively, and then folding it up, "I perceive," said he, "that I fall a victim to my religion, and that

my death is necessary to the emperor's schemes of extinguishing the protestant faith. But God will maintain his own cause. Come, cousin," said he, "take heed to your game;" and then, with the same composure as if he had received a private letter of little importance, he continued to play till he had defeated his antagonist. It is a satisfaction to learn that the emperor, impressed, as is said, by this admirable example of fortitude, gave immediate orders for a recal of the warrant, and ever afterwards treated the elector of Saxony with the highest respect and esteem*.

These disturbances in Germany continued to embroil the emperor during the remainder of his life, and utterly destroyed his peace. It was impossible for him to form his dominions into a well-connected empire. The jealousies that could not fail to subsist between his subjects of different countries, must have been an insuperable bar to such a coalescence, even though his foreign enemies had allowed him sufficient respite to turn his whole attention to the internal police of his kingdoms; but this we have seen was far from being the case. Henry II., the successor of Francis, was an antagonist equally formidable as

* Ascham sums up the character of this great man in these remarkable words:—"He is a man wise in all his doings, just in all his dealings, lowly to the meanest, princely with the highest, gentle to all. His noble nature thinketh nothing which he dare not speak, and speaketh nothing which he will not do. Him no adversity could ever move, nor policy at any time entice to shrink from God and from his word. The remembrance of him is never out of place, whose worthiness is never to be forgotten."

his father had been, and made more effective encroachments upon the dominions of the empire. In short, the last years of Charles were the most tumultuous and the least successful. The load of cares, and the difficulties which surrounded him on every side, at length entirely overpowered him. The vigour of his mind was broken, his animal spirits were exhausted, and in a state of despondency and melancholy dotage, he abdicated the empire, and renounced the world at the age of fifty-six.

This celebrated resignation, though prompted by dejection of spirit, was conducted with some policy, and with a regard to the interest of those who were to come after him. Charles wished that his son Philip should succeed not only to his hereditary dominions, but to the empire. He had, however, unluckily, in the earlier part of his life, taken a step which defeated this last purpose. This was the procuring his brother Ferdinand to be elected king of the Romans, which is always regarded as the preparatory step to the empire. Before Charles resigned the imperial crown, he proposed to his brother Ferdinand to resign in his favour, provided he would consent that Philip should be elected king of the Romans. A third person, however, struck in, and disappointed this negociation. This was the Archduke Maximilian, son of Ferdinand, a youth of abilities and ambition, who traversed all the emperor's schemes for that purpose, and secured the dignity of king of the Romans to himself. The defeat of this darling project entirely broke the spirit of Charles V. After a solemn resig-

nation of his hereditary dominions to his son Philip, he transmitted his resignation of the empire to his brother Ferdinand; and retiring to Spain, he betook himself to the monastery of St. Justus, where he soon after died, bequeathing to mankind a striking lesson of the vanity of human greatness, the madness of ambition, and the total insufficiency of all earthly dignities or possessions to the attainment of substantial or lasting happiness *.

It may not be improper to conclude this brief sketch of the reign of Charles V., with a few observations on the constitution of the German empire.

Till the reign of Maximilian I., the empire of Germany was a prey to all the disorders of the feudal government. Of this the 'Golden Bull,' published in 1356, affords sufficient evidence, as it proceeds on the supposition of great barbarism of manners. It is true that the Germans, like the Franks, preserved the ancient custom of holding *general diets*, or assemblies of the states; but these meetings were commonly of so short a continuance, and so extremely tumultuous, that they were of very little consequence in establishing wise political regulations. The Emperor Wenceslaus had, indeed, in the year 1383, endeavoured to give a better form to the empire. He proclaimed a general peace, but he

* Charles V. had no taste for literature, or disposition to patronise the arts and sciences; even the great Erasmus, who had dedicated to him some of his works, complains that he received nothing but barren thanks for the compliment.—Jortin's Life of Erasmus, p. 304.

found it impossible to take proper measures to secure it.

Sigismund made a similar attempt with no better success. But Albert II. was more fortunate. He actually accomplished the conclusion of a general peace between all the branches of the empire; and, with the consent of the assembly of the states, he divided Germany into six circles, or provinces, which were each to have their own diet or assembly. But still the great object was not completely attained: a spirit of jealousy and disunion continued to pervade the Germanic body, and frequent differences of interest, which were followed by hostile conflicts, threw them back into their former anarchy and barbarism.

At length Maximilian I. procured that famous law of the Germanic body, which established a general and a perpetual peace, by prohibiting all hostilities between the different states, under pain of that state which was the aggressor being treated as a common enemy. The *Imperial Chamber* was established to judge and determine all differences. A new division was made of the empire into ten circles, and each of these provinces named a certain number of representatives, or assessors, to take their place in the imperial chamber, and undertook to carry its decrees or judgments into execution, through the whole extent of its territory. The diet held at Augsburg in the year 1500 established likewise an occasional regency, which was to subsist, without interruption, in the intervals of the meetings of the diets. The regency was invested

with all the power of the national assembly. The council was composed of twenty ministers, named by the diet, over whom the emperor himself presided. One elector was always obliged to be personally present in the council; the other six sent their representatives.

Although these establishments gave a more regular form to the government, they would not have been adequate to the preservation of the peace of the empire, and the enforcement of the laws, had not the house of Austria acquired, of a sudden, so much power and influence as to establish itself on the imperial throne, and to render its authority more respectable than that of the former emperors. In fact, although the inferior princes, or electors, were in use to have recourse to the imperial chamber for a redress of grievances or encroachments, the more powerful chose rather to do themselves justice by force of arms; and, notwithstanding all the wise regulations, the ancient prejudices remained in full force, and the empire was still a prey to the same disorders.

The accession of Charles V. to the empire formed a remarkable era in its constitution. The princes wisely judged that his elevation was attended with danger; but they were short-sighted enough to imagine, that a capitulation would be sufficient to fix bounds to his authority. Charles had vast ambition, great resolution, and that *versatility* of character which could accommodate itself to any conduct most favourable to his political views. But amidst his ambitious projects, he seemed to have overlooked a very material circumstance: that new system of Euro-

pean politics, the motive of preserving a balance of power between the kingdoms of Christendom, which made the princes of the empire find allies and protectors sufficient to resist and traverse all his schemes of absolute dominion. Charles wished to turn to his own advantage that spirit of *religious enthusiasm* which was kindled in his time, but his extensive territories gave him too many objects of attention, and he could not prosecute any single enterprise with that constancy which was necessary to promote its success. He attained, however, a measure of authority very far superior to that of any of his predecessors, and virtually established his own family on a throne, which the constitution of the empire declared to be elective, and not hereditary.

The successors of Charles, without his talents, wished to pursue the same system of policy, and might, perhaps, have enslaved Germany, had it not been for the aid she received from other European powers. After a series of wars, and a great deal of bloodshed, the peace of Westphalia, in the year 1648, became the foundation of the public law of the empire, and fixed the emperor's prerogatives and the privileges of the states.

The power of electing an emperor was by the Golden Bull of Charles IV. (published in 1356), vested in seven electors, who were likewise appointed to fill the great offices of the empire. These electors were—the Archbishop of Mentz, Great Chancellor of the German empire; the elector of Cologne, Great Chancellor of the empire in Italy; the elector of Treves, Great Chancellor of the empire in Gaul; the King of Bohemia; the Count

Palatine; the Duke of Saxony; and the Margrave of Brandenburg. An eighth electorate was afterwards created—viz., that of Bavaria; and to these, in 1692, was added a ninth, that of Brunswick-Lunenburg, or Hanover.

All the princes of the empire acknowledged a legislative power to reside in the diet for the enactment of general laws, which regard the whole body of the state. The diet, or general assembly of the empire, was divided into three colleges, the electors, the princes, and the free cities. After the emperor's commissioner communicated his propositions to the diet, they became the subject of the separate deliberation of the electoral college, and that of the princes. When their opinions were uniform, the resolution was carried to the college of the free cities, and if acceded to by them, it became a *placitum* of the empire. If the emperor gave it his approbation, the *placitum* became a *conclusion*, and formed a *law* which was obligatory upon the whole of the states. If the emperor and the diet were of different opinions, there could be no general law. Thus, it was in the power of the emperor to prevent the enactment of any law, however salutary, which may be contrary to his own interest: a power which was not checked, as in the British government, by the sovereign's dependence on the people for his revenue. Agreeable to the same bad policy, the emperor was the sole proposer of all new laws, a further security for his proposing none but what were favourable to his own interests. It was, likewise, in the power of the director of the diet to prevent the execution of the established laws of the empire. Nothing

could be communicated to the diet but by the consent of the Elector-Archbishop of Mentz. All complaints of grievances, or requisitions made by any of the princes to the Germanic body, must receive his approbatory sanction, and he might refuse them at his pleasure.

These great constitutional defects were the more destructive, when it is considered that the Germanic government had for its object to regulate the contending interests of princes who had all the rights of sovereignty—who had their armies, their revenue, and their fortified cities, and a power of contracting defensive alliances with foreign nations, and were sometimes possessed themselves of foreign dominions greatly more considerable than their Germanic territory. The greater that are the sources of division between the parts of an empire, the greater certainly ought to be the prudence and fixity of its laws and policy.

CHAPTER XX.

Of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, and the Revolution in Denmark and Sweden—Reformation in England under Henry VIII. and his successors—Immediate causes—Sale of Indulgences—Luther attacks the abuses of the Romish Church—Zuinglius—Reformed Religion acknowledged by Decrees of the Senate in Zürich, Berne, and Basle—the Revolution in Denmark and Sweden—Gustavus Vasa—Anabaptists—Origin of the name of Protestant—Calvin—Origin of the Reformation in England—Henry declares himself Head of the Church—Persecution under Mary—Firmly established under Elizabeth.

THE age of Charles V. is the era of great events and important revolutions in the history of Europe. It is the era of the Reformation in religion in Germany, in the northern kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden, and in Britain. It is the era of the discovery of America; and lastly, it is the period of the highest splendour of the fine arts in Italy and in the south of Europe. Of each of these subjects we shall treat in order, and shall consider first the Reformation, as undoubtedly the most important, both in a moral and in a political point of view.

The splendid court, and the voluptuous taste of pope Leo X., demanded a greater supply of

money than what the patrimonial territories of the popedom could easily afford. A project had likewise been set on foot by his predecessor Julius II., which Leo keenly adopted, and which required a prodigious sum of money to carry it into execution. This was the building of St. Peter's church at Rome; a fabric which it was intended should surpass all the magnificent structures that had ever been reared by the art of man.

For the construction of this noble edifice, and to supply the luxuries of his court, Leo X. had recourse (to use an expression of Voltaire) to one of the keys of St. Peter, to open the coffers of Christians. Under the pretence of a crusade against the Turks, he instituted through all christendom a sale of indulgences, or releases from the pains of purgatory, which a pious man might purchase for a small sum of money either for himself or for his friends. Public offices were appointed for the sale of them in every town, and they were farmed or leased out to the keepers of taverns and bagnios. Their efficacy was proclaimed by all the preachers, who maintained that the most atrocious offences against religion might be expiated and forgiven by the purchase of a remission. A Dominican friar of the name of Tetzel, a principal agent in this extraordinary and most abominable merchandise, was wont to repeat in his public orations this blasphemous assertion, "That he himself had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences, than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by

his preaching *." This flagrant example of impiety and absurdity, could not fail to shock the understandings of the wiser and more rational even of the clergy; and among the rest Martin Luther, an Augustine monk, unable to repress his indignation, ventured, in a sermon which he publicly preached at Wittemberg the 30th September, 1517, to condemn in strong terms this infamous traffic, and plainly to accuse the pope himself as partaker of the guilt of his agents †.

Luther was a man of undaunted resolution,

* The form of the absolution issued by Tetzel was as follows:—

"I absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, and from all thy sins, how enormous soever: and by this plenary indulgence I remit thee all manner of punishment which thou oughtest to suffer in purgatory: And I restore thee to the sacraments of the church, and to that innocence and purity which thou hadst at thy baptism; so as, at death, the gates of hell shall be shut against thee, and the gates of paradise shall be laid open to receive thee. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen."—Keith's Hist. of Scotland, Introd. p. 4.

† Mr. Hume, in his history of the reign of Henry VIII., has chosen to derive the opposition of Luther to the doctrine of indulgences, from selfish and interested motives alone. He asserts that the Augustine friars, who had formerly in their hands the exclusive sale of these indulgences, were incensed at being deprived of that lucrative traffic, by the pope's bestowing it upon the Dominicans; and that in revenge for this affront they commissioned Luther, one of their order, to decry the efficacy of these remissions, and thus put a stop to the gain of the Dominicans. But this calumny has been completely refuted: it has been clearly shown that the fact on which it is founded, viz. that the exclusive right of sale was taken from the Augustines and bestowed on the

of a lively imagination, strong sense, and a considerable portion of learning. In the course of his invectives against the commerce of indulgences he was naturally led to examine the sources of that authority by which they were dispensed. The scandalous vices of the see of Rome were set in their strongest colours; and men began to perceive that there could be no merit in the sight of heaven in impoverishing themselves, to furnish supplies for the luxuries, the vanities, and crimes of a selfish and ambitious pontiff. Learning and a general spirit of inquiry were making rapid advances in the kingdoms of Europe. The art of printing had wonderfully disseminated knowledge, and furnished a ready vehicle for submitting all matters of controversy to the judgment of the world at large. The doctrines of Luther, which were at first vented in his sermons, attracted the notice of Frederic the elector of Saxony, who took him under his protection. Pope Leo, who was informed of his tenets, was at first inclined to pass the matter over without observation, as in truth his holiness had very little inclination to perplex himself with disputes of that kind. It became necessary, however, from the remonstrances of the more zealous part of the clergy, to take some notice of these new propositions of Luther, and to condemn them by a papal bull. The consequence was, that Luther, inflamed with zeal and indignation, no longer kept any measures with the see of Rome. He

Dominicans, is false.—See *the Translation of Mosheim.* Vol. ii. p. 17, 4to. edit.

composed a book, which he entitled 'The Babylonish Captivity,' in which he applied to the popedom all those flaming characters and dreadful denunciations of divine vengeance contained in Scripture against the impieties and adulteries of *the whore of Babylon*. He inveighed against private masses, that is to say, such as any man could purchase for a small piece of money to be said for his soul, or that of his friend: Transubstantiation he exploded, as neither the doctrine nor the word was to be found in Scripture. Luther indeed acknowledged that the body of our Saviour was present in the sacrament of bread and wine, but very reasonably denied that the bread and wine were actually changed into flesh and blood. The Dominicans in Germany ordered this work of Luther's to be burnt by the hand of the public executioner. But the reformer was not intimidated: he, on his part, caused the pope's bull and the decretals to be burnt in the market-place at Wittemberg. He began to be supported by a very formidable party in Germany, and he every day opened some new battery of attack against the tenets of the Romish religion. The vows of the priests and their celibacy were represented as diabolical institutions, in opposition to the direct commands of God Almighty. The refusal of the communion in wine to the people, was treated as a similar piece of impiety, in violation of the express injunctions and example of our Saviour. In short, Luther disputed openly every one of the tenets of the Romish church, for which no express

authority could be pointed out in the word of God.

One of the first champions of the see of Rome, who took up his pen against Luther, was Henry VIII., king of England—the person who we shall see became a few years afterwards the most inveterate enemy of the pope's jurisdiction. Henry had been educated in all the subtleties of the schools, and was fond of passing for a man of learning, and an adept in the vain philosophy of the times. He asked leave of Leo to read and to examine the works of Luther, which at that time were prohibited under pain of excommunication; and in a short time he composed a treatise in defence of the seven sacraments, against the attacks of Luther, which was received by pope Leo (who very probably never read it) with the highest approbation. Henry and his successors (in return for this service done to the church) had the title given them of *Defenders of the Faith.*

Meantime the rest of Europe took very little share in these disputes, which were confined almost solely to Germany. Charles V. was obliged to keep on good terms with the pope, who gave him his assistance against the attempts of Francis I. upon Italy. He therefore found it necessary to declare against the tenets of Luther, and he summoned him to attend an imperial diet at Worms, and there give an account of his new doctrines. The reformer appeared and pleaded his cause with great spirit and resolution. It is said, that the pope's nuncio solicited Charles, who had given Luther a safe

canduct, to deliver him up to the court of Rome; as his predecessor Sigismund had behaved by John Huss in the like circumstances: but Charles made answer, that *he* did not choose to have cause to blush like Sigismund; and he permitted Luther, though condemned by the council, to avail himself of his protection and escape into Saxony. The elector of Saxony was now his avowed friend and patron. He found his disciples daily increasing: the mass was abolished in the town of Wittemberg, and soon after through all Saxony. The images of the saints were broken to pieces; the convents were shut up; the monks and nuns returned to a life of freedom; and Luther, to enforce his doctrines by his own example, married a nun himself. It should be acknowledged, to the honour of the reformed religion, that those priests who now returned to the world, gave no handle to their adversaries to reproach them with making an improper use of their freedom. So far from it, that the manners of the reformed clergy are universally acknowledged to have exhibited a very striking contrast to the dissolute and scandalous practices which had long prevailed in the monasteries.

The celebrated Erasmus, whose sceptical turn of mind and strong ironical talent had, before the appearance of Luther, paved the way for his doctrines by many oblique sarcasms against the abuses of the Romish church, has enumerated in one of his works what he esteems to have been capital errors in the measures taken against Luther by the see of Rome. These may be

reduced to six articles, as to some of which the judgment of Erasmus is certainly right; in others, perhaps, disputable. The first error was, that the see of Rome permitted those theses about indulgences to be disputed in sermons before the people. 2nd. That they opposed to Luther only some mendicant friars, who were but so many declaimers and trumpets of slander. 3rd. Says he, they should have silenced the preachers of both parties, and appointed learned, prudent, and peaceable men, who would have calmly and temperately instructed the people, and recommended unanimity and the love of the gospel. 4th. It was a capital error, that neither party would yield or give up the smallest or most trifling article. 5th. The cruelties of the Catholics against the Lutherans promoted the success of their doctrines. 6th. The most effectual means of persuading men of the truth of their religion, would have been to have seriously amended their lives, and showed an example of penitence and real sanctity*. The three last of these articles are, without doubt, most justly a reproach to the Catholics, and are perfectly unanswerable; but the others, perhaps, could not be avoided, considering the state of the church at that time and the opinions of man-

* "There is no better way," says Lord Bacon, "to stop the rise of new sects and schisms, than to reform abuses, compound the lesser differences, proceed mildly from the first; refrain from sanguinary persecutions, and rather to soften and win the principal leaders, by gracing and advancing them, than to enrage them by violence and bitterness."—Bacon's Moral Essays, sect. i., essay xii.

kind. Hence, Bayle has made a very just inference when he concludes that Luther's design could not have found a more favourable juncture.

Switzerland was the first of the European countries that followed the example of Germany. Zuinglius, a priest of Zurich, carried matters even further than Luther, and denied absolutely that the bread and wine in the holy sacrament partook in any degree of the substance of the body and blood of Christ. The authority of this pastor over his native city was very remarkable. He was accused before the senate, and the cause being tried in form, a plurality of voices declared in Zuinglius's favour. The sentence was intimated to the people of Zurich, and in a moment they all declared themselves of the reformed religion. The churches were purified, the images pulled down, and the mass abolished.

Some years after this the city of Berne determined this cause in a manner still more solemn. The Romish religion was condemned by the senate, after a disputation which lasted two months. The sentence was notified to the whole canton, and most cheerfully received; and the people of Basle soon after compelled their senate to pronounce a like decree. Five of the smallest cantons in Switzerland were yet zealous adherents to the church of Rome, and took up arms in defence of their faith. An army of Protestants was levied in order to convert them, but Zuinglius, at their head, was unfortunately killed and his party defeated. The Catholics,

who considered him as a detestable heretic, ordered his body to be cut in pieces and burnt to ashes.

Meantime Lutheranism was making its progress towards the north of Europe. Religion was the cause of a very great and important revolution at this time, in the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark. Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, had been united under Margaret of Waldemar, in the year 1397. The Swedes endeavoured to break this union, in the year 1452. They rose in rebellion, and unanimously chose their great marshal, Charles Canutson, for their king. They were, however, forced again to submit to the yoke of Denmark. Being again oppressed, they rebelled once more, and elected for themselves a governor, at the time when Christiern II., a most tyrannical prince, was raised to the throne of the united kingdoms. Trollo, the archbishop of Upsal, in Sweden, carried on a correspondence with the tyrant to extinguish the liberties of his native country. The great senate of Sweden deposed him on that account from his episcopal dignity. The prelate had recourse to Leo X., who granted him a bull, laying the kingdom under a sentence of excommunication. The king and his primate armed with this instrument of vengeance set out for Stockholm. The affrighted Swedes returned to their allegiance, acknowledged the authority of Christiern, and Trollo was restored to his episcopal functions. Seven hostages were given as a security of the loyalty of the Swedes, and among these was the young Gustavus Vasa, who

was destined to be the deliverer of his country. After this accommodation, so favourable to Christiern, the principal senators and nobles were invited by the monarch to an entertainment. Amidst the most unbounded festivity, the archbishop made his entry, the pope's bull in his hand, and in the name of the church demanded satisfaction for the usage he had sustained. The sentence of excommunication was read aloud, and the tyrant Christiern ordered his guards to seize the whole senate and nobility. Ninety-four senators, and an immense number of the nobility and citizens, were put to death without mercy, and the whole city of Stockholm was a scene of carnage. Among those who were the victims to this infernal revenge was Eric Vasa, the father of young Gustavus, and nephew to Charles Canutson. It was the good fortune of this youth to escape from prison; he fled to the mountains of Dalecarlia, were he concealed himself in the disguise of a workman in the mines. By degrees he opened his project to his companions, discovered to them his name and rank, and soon attached to himself a considerable number of adherents. The city of Lubeck furnished them with arms, and he was joined by such numbers, that at length he took the field against the generals of Christiern, gained some advantages, and recovered a considerable part of the country. That inhuman tyrant took a revenge worthy of himself; he caused the mother and sister of Gustavus, whom he had long confined in prison, to be sewed up in a sack and thrown into the sea.

The Danes themselves, irritated by the oppressions of Christiern, determined at length to throw off the yoke. His uncle Frederic, duke of Holstein, headed the insurrection, and Denmark, by the voice of the chief nobility and senators, pronounced a formal sentence of deposition, which they transmitted to Christiern in his palace at Copenhagen. A single magistrate entered his presence, and delivered to him his sentence, which he obeyed like a coward, as he had reigned like a tyrant. He betook himself to Flanders, where he in vain solicited assistance from his father-in-law, the Emperor Charles V., to regain his kingdom. The duke of Holstein was elected king of Denmark and Norway; and Gustavus Vasa, the deliverer of his country, was rewarded with the crown of Sweden, which had formerly been held by his grand-uncle Charles Canutson.

The bull of Leo X., and its bloody consequences, had entirely alienated the minds of the Swedes and Danes from the religion of Rome. Gustavus was a convert to the opinions of Luther, whose tenets had made considerable progress in the northern kingdoms. Frederic, king of Denmark, concurred with him in the design, and they found it no difficult matter to establish the Reformed religion in place of the Catholic. The clergy were the more easily reconciled to it as the episcopal hierarchy was preserved, though the revenues of the bishops and their ecclesiastical jurisdiction were considerably retrenched. Gustavus Vasa reigned in peace for a long term of years, and though an absolute monarch con-

tributed greatly to the happiness and aggrandisement of his kingdom. He was the first who made foreign nations sensible of the weight which Sweden might have in the affairs of Europe, at the time when, as we have already seen, European policy was putting on a new face, and when the idea first arose of establishing a balance of power.

While the tenets of Luther were thus rapidly gaining ground in the north, the following fact will convince us, that he arrogated to himself an authority, very little short of that of the pope, in Germany.

Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, had taken a disgust at his wife, a princess of the house of Saxony, who he alleged was intolerably ugly, and addicted to drunkenness. The secret was, that he had fallen in love with a young lady of the name of Saal, whom he wanted to marry. Luther at this time, with five of his followers, was holding a kind of synod at Wittemberg for the regulation of all matters regarding the church. The Landgrave presented to him a petition, setting forth his case, in which he at the same time insinuated, that in case Luther and his doctors should refuse him a dispensation of polygamy, he would, perhaps, be obliged to ask it of the pope. The synod were under considerable difficulty. The interest of the Landgrave was too formidable to be disregarded, and at the same time to favour him, they must assume to themselves a power of breaking a law of scripture. The temporal consideration was more powerful than the spiritual one. They agreed to give Philip a dispensation for polygamy, and he ac-

cordingly married his favourite, even with the consent of his former wife.

The successful example of Luther gave rise to reformers of different kinds, and among the rest two fanatics of Saxony, whose names were Stork and Muncer, pretended to reform both the Catholics and the Lutherans. It was their notion that the gospel gave them a warrant for propagating their tenets by force of arms, which they grounded on these words of scripture: "I am come not to send peace, but a sword." They condemned the baptism of infants, and *rebaptized* their disciples when they were *come to the age of manhood*, whence they got the name of Anabaptists. They preached up an universal equality among mankind, and strenuously contended both for religious and civil liberty; but it was their error to be too violent. They had not strength to support their sanguinary notion of converting men by the sword; and after committing some horrible outrages, they were defeated by the regular troops of the empire, and Muncer and several of his associates had their heads cut off upon a scaffold at Mulhausen.

The united power of the emperor and the pope found it no longer possible, however, to stop the progress of the reformation. The diet of Spires endeavoured to accommodate matters by articles of reconciliation between the Lutherans and Catholics. Fourteen of the cities of Germany and several of the electors entered a formal *protest* against the articles of the diet of Spires; and from this circumstance, the partisans of the reformed religion became ever after distinguished

by the name of Protestants. The Protestants gave in to the assembly of Augsburg a confession of their faith, which has become the standard of their doctrines.

The Anabaptists, who were not suppressed by their defeat at Mulhausen, and the fate of their leader and spiritual guide, continued to commit new devastations. They surprised and took possession of the city of Munster, where they preached their doctrines with such effect, that the people, inspired with frenzy, expelled their bishop, and declared that they would have no other governor than God Almighty. Matthias, who was their chief prophet, having been killed in a sally from the town upon the troops of the bishop who had laid siege to it, John Boccold, a journeyman tailor, who had been distinguished by the name of Jack of Leyden, caused himself with great ceremony to be anointed king, and appointed twelve apostles to proclaim his sovereign authority over all the lower Germany. One of his favourite tenets was polygamy, and he set a most illustrious example himself by marrying fourteen wives. One of his wives having expressed some doubt as to his divine mission, Boccold immediately cut off her head, and the thirteen others danced round her body with transports of joy. Munster being closely besieged, this fanatic defended the city obstinately during twelve months: but he fell at length a victim to the treachery of some of his own followers; and his enemies, whom his obstinate courage had much exasperated, put him to death with every circumstance of cruelty. The sect of

the Anabaptists was not annihilated; but what is very extraordinary, from being the most sanguinary of all the species of religious enthusiasts, they are become one of the most peaceable and harmless.

In the meantime, while these outrages of the Anabaptists furnished a handle of invective to the generality of the Catholics against every kind of innovation in religion, the more rational part of them beheld in the austere but pure and simple manners of the Protestant leaders a contrast which was very favourable to the progress of the reformation. The dispassionate and solemn manner in which the cities of Switzerland had proceeded, attracted the attention and respect of all Europe. The magistrates of Geneva, after a long and most deliberate discussion in the senate, where everybody was at liberty to propose arguments or to answer them, solemnly condemned the Romish religion, and put up that memorable inscription which is still to be seen in the town-house: "*In remembrance of the divine goodness, by which he hath enabled us to shake off the yoke of Antichrist, to abolish superstition, and to recover our liberty.*" The Protestants here got the name of Eignots, a corrupted term, signifying *bound by an oath**, which has since been further corrupted into Huguenots.

John Calvin, vulgarly accounted the founder of the reformation at Geneva, was not in fact so; matters had taken that turn I have mentioned, and the senate had established the Protestant creed, before this reformer made any

* A corruption of the German word *Eid-genossen.*

figure. Calvin, who was a Frenchman, and born at Noyons, was possessed of very good talents, and wrote much better than Luther. He had, likewise, a considerable share of the learning of the times, that is to say, Latin, Greek, and School philosophy; but his disposition was harsh, austere, and tyrannical. On his coming to Geneva, he found the Protestant creed extremely agreeable in most points to the notions which he had propagated in his 'Institutiones Christianæ;' but he foresaw that articles of faith would not be long in observance without a proper system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to enforce them; he, therefore, established synods, consistories, and deacons, and prescribed a regular form of praying and of preaching. The magistracy of Geneva gave these ordinances the authority of law; and they were adopted by six of the Swiss cantons, by the Protestants of France, and the Presbyterians of Scotland. His ablest advocates will find no apology for his persecution of the learned Castalio, whom he caused to be expelled from his country; and far less for the inhumanity of his conduct to Servetus, who, having presumed to controvert some of his tenets, was tied to a stake and burnt alive. These, it must be owned, are no commendable methods of propagating the mild and humane religion of Jesus Christ. The truth is, neither Luther nor Calvin assumed the character of inspired apostles: if they had, their follies and their vices would have belied their pretence; but the scheme of reformation which they proposed, and partially brought about, was unquestionably

a good one, whoever had been its founders. It is to be examined by the test of reason, and derives no blemish or dishonour from the men, or even the motives which first gave rise to it. This observation will apply yet in a stronger degree to what I must now proceed to give an account of,—the rise and progress of the Reformation in England.

The origin of the Reformation in England is to be traced to a cause still more remote from the real interests of religion than that which gave rise to the reformation in Germany.

As early as the middle of the fourteenth century, the learned Wicliffe had begun an attack against many of the abuses in the church of Rome, both in his sermons to the people and in his writings. In order to render the perusal of the scriptures more universal, he translated them into the vernacular tongue, a measure by no means agreeable to the Romish teachers, whose aim it had ever been to prevent the people at large from any exercise of their own judgment in spiritual matters, that they might more implicitly rely on the guidance of the church. The doctrines of Wicliffe had their influence with many men of learning and talents; but they had not an extensive currency with the people. These were taught to stigmatise the followers of Wicliffe by the name of Lollards, a term of reproach and ridicule; but this did not hinder his opinions from making their way by a silent progress among the rational and thinking part of the nation. Such was the state of things at the beginning of the reign of Henry

VIII., who was a prince zealously attached from education to the doctrines of the church of Rome; but he was yet more addicted to the unrestrained gratification of his passions, and this, in fact, was one of the minor, though immediate, causes of the reformation in England.

Henry VIII. had been married for above eighteen years to Catharine of Spain, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and aunt to Charles V., by whom he had three children, one of them then alive, the Princess Mary, afterwards queen of England. Henry was a voluptuous prince and fond of women. Among others of his favourites, he conceived a passion for Anne Bullen, the daughter of a private gentleman, who had either the prudence or the address, by resisting his advances, to win so much upon his affections, as to make him form the resolution of raising her to the throne, and displacing Queen Catharine; the difficulty was, how to obtain a divorce; but an expedient was not long wanting. Catharine had been first married to Prince Arthur, the elder brother of Henry VIII., and upon his death was married to Henry, in virtue of a dispensation from Pope Julius II. The conscience of Henry began to be extremely alarmed on account of this incestuous connexion, which he had now maintained for eighteen years: he, therefore, solicited Clement VII. to annul the dispensation of his predecessor Julius, and to declare his marriage with Catharine to be a violation of divine and human laws. Clement was reduced to a most disagreeable dilemma. It was absolutely necessary for him to be on

good terms with the Emperor Charles V., yet he was extremely unwilling to incur the resentment or enmity of a prince of Henry's violent disposition. In this situation, he endeavoured to gain time by negociating, temporising and settling preliminaries, in hopes that, in the mean time, Henry's passion might cool, and there might be no necessity for so disagreeable a decision; but the pontiff was mistaken; the king of England had the matter most seriously at heart, and was resolved to compass this match with Anne Bullen whatever it might cost him. He applied to the doctors of the Sorbonne at Paris, and the other French universities, for their opinion upon this momentous case, which his agents, by the proper distribution of English gold, found means to secure in his favour. Even the Jewish Rabbis were consulted; and all finally concurred in declaring the marriage with Catharine to be illegal, and that Pope Julius had no right to have dispensed with the law of Leviticus. Armed with this authority, Henry, who had his own clergy at his command, prevailed on Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, to annul his marriage. The repudiated queen retired from court, and Anne Bullen was advanced to her dignity. It was the negociation of this divorce which occasioned the fall of Cardinal Wolsey. Henry imputed the pope's hesitation in that affair to Wolsey's disapprobation of the measure. He had, as we have formerly observed, made the cardinal chancellor of England. He now deprived him of that office, and confiscated his whole estate. He relented, however, a short

time afterwards: Wolsey was allowed for some time to enjoy his temporal possessions; but the inconstant monarch soon after renewed his prosecutions, and the cardinal being arrested for high treason, disease and anguish of mind put an end to his life. He was succeeded in the office of Chancellor by Sir Thomas More, a man of low extraction, but worthy, by his integrity and abilities, of the dignity to which he was raised. He, too, soon after fell a sacrifice to the inhumanity and caprice of his master.

Clement VII., who saw that it was impossible to look for the favour of Henry, resolved, at least, to keep well with the emperor, and for this purpose he immediately issued a bull condemning the sentence of the archbishop of Canterbury. This measure deprived the see of Rome of all authority over the kingdom of England. Henry immediately obliged his clergy to declare *him* head of the church; and his parliament, without hesitation, confirmed this title, and entirely suppressed the pope's authority within his dominions. The first measure which he took in virtue of his supremacy of the national church was the abolition of the monasteries, and the confiscation of their immense riches, which, according to Bishop Burnet's calculation, amounted, besides an immense value in plate and jewels, to a yearly revenue of 1,600,000*l.* Out of these spoils he founded six new bishoprics, and a college;—rewarded a few of his own servants so largely as to enable them to found what are now some of the wealthiest houses in

the British peerage;—and converted the remainder to his own use. It was pity that, in the execution of this measure, which was certainly attended with many substantial political advantages, there should have been so much indulgence of that savage spirit of destruction which has deprived posterity not only of many of the finest Gothic structures, but of many valuable treasures of learning which were contained in the libraries belonging to the ancient abbeys and monasteries.

Yet Henry, though he had thus quarrelled with the pope, and despoiled and abolished the monasteries, had not renounced the *religion* of the church of Rome. He still prided himself on his title of Defender of the Faith, and he continued, in every respect, to be a good catholic, except that he chose to be pope in his own kingdom. He was as great an enemy to the tenets of Luther, of Calvin, or of Wicliffe, as he was to the supremacy of the Roman pontiff; and the favourers of the latter, as well as those who espoused the doctrines of the former, were equally the victims of sanguinary persecution. Meantime the passion of the king was cooled for Anne Bullen, and had changed its object. He had fallen in love with Jane Seymour, one of the maids of honour, and he was not ashamed to accuse the queen of adultery upon the most frivolous grounds, which might have been furnished by the conduct of even the most virtuous woman upon earth. Compliments, idly paid to her beauty by some of her courtiers, were construed into proofs of a criminal intercourse. The parliament, with the meanest sub-

mission to the will of the tyrant, passed sentence of death, and Anne Bullen was removed from the throne to the scaffold. She left by Henry a daughter, Elizabeth, afterwards queen of England. Henry was *next day* publicly married to Jane Seymour, who, happily for herself, died about a year afterwards. His *fourth* wife was Anne of Cleves, who did not retain his affections above nine months. He represented to his clergy, that at the time he married her he had not given his inward consent; but it is less surprising that a monarch of this character should urge such an excuse, than that his clergy and parliament should sustain it. Anne was divorced, and he married for his *fifth* wife Catharine Howard. It was upon this occasion that Sir Thomas More incurred, as Wolsey had done, the indignation of his sovereign. He disapproved of the match with Catharine: he was accused of heresy and treason, condemned and beheaded. The character of Catharine Howard, which had been rather suspicious *before* her marriage, was soon a sufficient pretext for a new sentence of divorce; yet her crimes, in the eye of Henry, were such as nothing but her blood could expiate, and she, like Anne Bullen, was publicly beheaded. Catharine Parr, the *sixth* in order whom this tyrant advanced to his bed, escaped very narrowly from the fate of her predecessors, for having dared, with too much zeal, to combat some of his religious opinions: she, however, had the good fortune to survive him. The political occurrences of the reign of Henry, as we have seen, regarded chiefly matters of religion. His warlike enterprises we have already

taken notice of, in treating of his contemporaries the Emperor Charles V., Francis I. of France, and James V. of Scotland. He died at length, to the relief of his subjects, in the year 1547, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and left the throne of England to Edward VI., his son by Jane Seymour.

During the reign of Edward VI., the Protestant religion prevailed in England, because the sentiments of the prince were favourable to the doctrines of the reformation; but this period of toleration was short, for Edward, of whom his people had justly conceived great hopes, died at the early age of fifteen. He had, upon his death-bed, conveyed the crown to his cousin, Lady Jane Grey, descended of Henry VII., in prejudice of his sister Mary; but, after a short struggle, which can hardly be called a civil war, the party of Mary prevailed, and the unfortunate Jane fell a victim to the partial affection of her cousin, and the favour of a great body of the people, who wished to see her settled upon a throne which her moderation would rather have declined than accepted. Mary, who inherited the cruel and tyrannical disposition of her father, began her reign by putting to death her cousin Jane, together with her father-in-law and husband. This outset was a prognostic of the temper of her reign, which was one continued scene of bloodshed and persecution. The Protestants, who had multiplied exceedingly during the short reign of Edward, were persecuted with the most sanguinary rigour. It was a doctrine of Mary's, as Bishop Burnet informs us, that as the souls

of heretics are afterwards to be eternally burning in hell, there could be nothing more proper than to imitate the divine vengeance, by burning them on earth. In the course of this reign it is computed that about eight hundred persons were burnt alive in England. Yet this monster of a woman died in peace; with the consideration, no doubt, of having merited eternal happiness as a reward of that zeal she had shown in support of the true religion *.

* Mary had prepared to employ the same means for the extirpation of heresy from her kingdom of Ireland, but her purpose was defeated by a singular accident. The following account was found among the MSS. of Sir James Ware, copied from the papers of Richard, earl of Cork:—

"Queen Mary having dealt severely with the Protestants in England, about the latter end of her reign, signed a commission for to take the same course with them in Ireland; and to execute the same with greater force, she nominates Dr. Cole one of the commissioners. This doctor coming with the commission to Chester, on his journey, the mayor of that city, hearing that her majesty was sending a messenger into Ireland, and he being a churchman, waited on the doctor, who, in discourse with the mayor, taketh out of a cloak-bag a leather box, saying unto him, *Here is a commission that will lash the heretics of Ireland* (calling the Protestants by that title). The good-woman of the house being well affected to the Protestant religion, and also having a brother, named John Edmonds, of the same, then a citizen in Dublin, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but watching her convenient time, while the mayor took his leave, and the doctor complimented him down stairs, she opens the box, takes the commission out, and places in lieu thereof a sheet of paper with a pack of cards wrapped up therein, the knave of clubs being faced uppermost. The doctor coming up to his chamber, suspecting nothing of what had been done, put up the box as formerly. The next day going to the water-side, wind and weather serving him, he sails towards Ireland, and landed on the 7th of October, 1558, at Dublin. Then

Mary was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Bullen—a Protestant; and, perhaps, more zealously so, from an abhorrence of the creed of her sister. The bulk of the nation, influenced naturally by the same motives, became in her reign zealous Protestants. From that period the religion of England became stationary. The liturgy was settled in its present form, and the hierarchy of protestant archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons established as it now continues. The Church of England, in her tenets, has chiefly conformed to the Lutheran system of reformation.

The reign of Elizabeth, on many accounts remarkable, we shall by and by consider in a civil point of view. It is sufficient at present to ob-

coming to the castle, the Lord Fitzwalters being Lord Deputy, sent for him to come before him and the privy-council; who, coming in, after he had made a speech, relating upon what account he came over, he presents the box unto the Lord Deputy, who causing it to be opened, that the secretary might read the commission, there was nothing save a pack of cards, with the knave of clubs uppermost; which not only startled the Lord Deputy and Council, but the doctor, who assured them he had a commission, but knew not how it was gone. Then the Lord Deputy made answer—*Let us have another commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the mean while.* The doctor, being troubled in his mind, went away, and returned into England; and coming to the court, obtained another commission; but staying for a wind on the water-side, news came to him that the queen was dead; and thus God preserved the Protestants of Ireland."

Queen Elizabeth was so delighted with this story, that she sent for Elizabeth Edmonds, and gave her a pension of forty pounds during her life. See Cox, Hibernia Anglicana, or History of Ireland, vol. ii. p. 308.—Harleian Miscellany, No. 79. —Mosheim's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 70.

serve, that with regard to religion her administration was mild and moderate. The laws gave their countenance to the established mode of worship, but authorised no persecution of those who peaceably proved themselves good and quiet subjects, whatever were their opinions on controverted points of theology.

Thus the doctrines of the reformation obtained, as we have seen, in the course of half a century, a permanent footing in Germany and Switzerland, in Denmark and Sweden, and in England. The progress of the reformation in Scotland we shall afterwards observe in treating of the reign of Queen Elizabeth and of Mary queen of Scots. But we have not yet accomplished our plan of a complete delineation of those remarkable occurrences which characterised the reign of Charles V.

CHAPTER XXI.

DISCOVERY of AMERICA. — Columbus discovers Cuba — The Caribbees—America—Description of Inhabitants and Productions—Cruelties of the Spaniards—Conquest of Mexico —Discovery of Peru—Administration of the Spaniards— Possessions of other European Nations in America.

AMONG those great events which distinguished the reign of Charles V. was the conquest of Mexico by Fernando Cortes, and of Peru by the Pizarros. The discovery of the American continent by Columbus was made some years before, in the preceding reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, but we have postponed till now to mention that great event, that we may here delineate the whole in one connected view.

The union of the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon under Ferdinand and Isabella rendered Spain, as we have seen, one of the most powerful monarchies in Europe. The enterprising genius of one man now opened to her a source of wealth, to all appearance inexhaustible.

Christopher Columbus, an obscure individual, but a man of a penetrating genius, struck with the enterprises of the Portuguese, was seized with an irresistible ardour of achieving something that might perpetuate his fame, while, at the same time, it gratified his predominant

passion of curiosity, and the love of adventure. He applied first to the state of Genoa, of which he was a subject, and humbly solicited the public aid for assistance to attempt some discoveries in the western seas. He was treated as a visionary by his countrymen; and with the same ill success he made application to the courts of Portugal and of England. He then betook himself to Spain, where, after several years fruitless solicitation, he at length obtained from Ferdinand and Isabella an armament of three small ships, and the sum of seventeen thousand ducats, for defraying the expenses of his voyage. After a navigation of thirty-three days from the Canary Islands, during which time his crew, despairing of ever obtaining sight of land, repeatedly threatened to throw their admiral overboard, he at length arrived at one of the Bahama islands, which he named San Salvador; and soon after he discovered the islands of Cuba and Hispaniola, which he took possession of in the name of the monarchs of Spain. The inhabitants of those islands, from their distance from the continent, could give him no hopes of those immense discoveries which were to follow; he therefore returned, within the course of seven months, to Spain, bringing with him some of the natives of Hispaniola, some rarities of the country, and some presents in gold. He was received with triumphal honours, and regarded by the Spaniards as an angel dropped from heaven. There was now no difficulty in prevailing with Ferdinand and Isabella to equip a new armament for the prosecution of these discoveries.

Columbus sailed a second time with a fleet of seventeen ships, and returned after the discovery of the Caribbee Islands and of Jamaica. But his enemies, jealous of the reputation he had acquired, had prevailed on the court of Spain to send along with his fleet an officer, who, in the character of justiciary, might establish such regulations in the new colonies as were most for the advantage of the Spanish government. This officer, on account of some differences between Columbus and his soldiers, put the admiral in irons on board his own ship, and returned with him a prisoner to Spain. The court, it is true, repaired this affront in the best manner possible. Columbus justified his conduct, and was sent out a third time in the prosecution of new discoveries. It was in this third voyage that he descried the continent, within ten degrees of the equator, towards that part of South America where Carthagena was afterwards built. To this immense continent Amerigo Vespuzio had the honour of giving his name, as he was the first that reported in Europe the intelligence of that discovery; of which, though he only followed the footsteps of Columbus, he arrogated to himself the merit.

The Americans are a tall race of men, of just proportions, and of a strong conformation of limbs. The colour of their skin is a reddish brown; their hair is long, lank, and black, extremely coarse, and they have no appearance of beard; a circumstance which is alleged by M. de Pau as a proof of their being a degenerate race of men, but which seems rather to be a

clear specific difference. The inhabitants of this immense continent—if we except those of Mexico and Peru, which were comparatively refined and luxurious nations—were tribes of wandering savages, and utterly unacquainted with almost every art of civilised life. They were naked, except a small covering round the middle; their sole occupation was the chase, and when the season of hunting was at an end, the American, if not engaged in war, spent his time in perfect indolence: half the day was consumed in sleep, and the other half in immoderate eating and drinking. The Indians of America were in their disposition grave even to sadness: they held in contempt the levity of manners of the Europeans, and observing great taciturnity themselves, imputed to childishness all idle talk or conversation. Their behaviour was modest and respectful, and in their solemn councils their deliberations were carried on with the greatest order and decorum.

In each tribe there was a species of government which was vested in the chief and in the council of the elders, the authority of the former being balanced by the latter, and prevented from becoming despotical. The chief, therefore, was understood no longer to have a right to dominion, than while he used his power with moderation. He had neither guards, nor prisons, nor officers of justice. The concurrence, therefore, of the tribe was essential to every exercise of his authority. The council was composed of the seniors of the tribe, on whom age and long experience were supposed to have con-

ferred a more ample knowledge of the interests of the tribe, and of the powers and strength of its enemies. These elders met in a hut appropriated for the purpose, and here their deliberations were held, and their orators declaimed with great force of language and the most expressive gesticulation. When the council was over, the whole tribe partook of a feast, which was accompanied with warlike dancing, and songs, in which they rehearsed the heroic exploits of their deceased forefathers.

To nations living by hunting, and thus ranging over immense tracts of countries, there must frequently happen such interferences between different tribes as to occasion hostile conflicts and even long-continued wars. It was even no unusual thing for a few individuals of a tribe to solicit permission of the chief to undertake an expedition to avenge any injury they had received, and leave being obtained, the war-kettle was set on the fire as a symbol of their intention of devouring their enemies. This dreadful ceremony was held as an invitation to all to assemble themselves who chose to join the expedition.

The mode in which their wars were conducted was various in the different tribes. It does not appear that, in their engagements, they observed any regular disposition or arrangement; but as soon as they met with their enemies, after sending forth a dreadful cry, they fell on with the impetuous fury of wild beasts; when the one party prevailed, it was a rule to pursue their success by an undistinguishing carnage, as long as the enemy gave the smallest resistance. When

that was over, they bound and carried off the prisoners, who were reserved for the most cruel and tormenting death. This the captives themselves knew, and were prepared for. They had, however, one chance of life: for, on returning to their village, the victors made offer to each family of a captive for every relation they had lost in the war. This offer they might either accept or reject. If accepted, the captive became a member of the family; if rejected, he was doomed to die under the most excruciating tortures. In these executions, the women would bear their part, and seem actuated by the spirit of furies. What is most remarkable is the fortitude with which these unhappy wretches submitted to their fate. There was a contest between them and their tormentors which should exceed, these in inflicting, or the others in enduring the greatest exacerbations of pain. It is even said that by insults they endeavoured to provoke their executioners, and stimulate their fury by telling them of the cruelties they had themselves inflicted on their countrymen. "You are ignorant wretches," said they: "you know nothing of the art of tormenting. Had you seen the tortures which we and our friends exercised over your countrymen, you would confess your inferiority, and despise your own ignorance."

This horrid picture would seem to argue a disposition so hardened as to allow no tincture of the common feelings of humanity; but the inference would be altogether unjust. The cruelty of the Indians to their enemies is known to have been compatible with the warmest affections to

their friends, and with a measure of generosity, benevolence, and humanity almost exceeding belief. The selfish feelings are the fostered growth of luxury and over-civilisation. Disinterestedness and generosity are the characteristics of the savage. His life as well as his property are devoted to the service of his friends, and the connexions of civilised man are a slender tie when compared with the fervour of attachment manifested by the wild untutored Indian. Of the strength and ardour of their affections, there can be no proof so strong as that which arises from their treatment of the dead. Believing in the immortality of the soul, they bury along with the deceased his bow and his arrows, together with the most splendid ornaments which belonged to him. They attend him to the grave with the deepest demonstrations of sorrow, and those who are his nearest relations retire for a great length of time to their huts, and refuse to take any concern in the active occupations of the tribe. But this is not all:—their concern for the dead is manifested in a manner yet more striking, by a ceremony the most solemn, and the most awfully affecting that imagination can devise. At stated periods is held what is termed the feast of the dead, or the feast of souls, when all the bodies of those who have died since the last ceremony of that kind, are taken out of their graves and brought together from the greatest distances to one place. The striking circumstances attending this general disinterment are painted in strong colours by Lafitau, in his 'Mœurs des Sauvages.'

"Without question," says he, "this opening of the tombs displays one of the most striking scenes that can be conceived; this humbling portrait of human misery in so many images of death, wherein she seems to take a pleasure to paint herself in a thousand various shapes of horror, in the several carcasses, according to the degree in which corruption has prevailed over them, or the manner in which it has attacked them. Some appear dry and withered; others have a sort of parchment upon their bones; some look as if they were baked and smoked, without any appearance of rottenness; some are just beginning to putrify, while others are all swarming with worms and drowned in corruption. I know not," continues he, "which ought to strike us most, the horror of so shocking a sight, or the tender piety and affection of these poor people towards their departed friends; for nothing deserves our admiration more than that eager diligence and attention with which they discharge this melancholy duty; gathering up with care even the smallest bones, handling the carcasses, disgustful as they are with every thing hideous, cleansing them from the worms, and carrying them upon their shoulders through tiresome journeys of several days, without being discouraged by the loathsomeness of their state, and without manifesting any other emotions than those of regret for having lost persons so dear to them in their lives and so lamented in their death."—A great pit is now dug in the ground; and thither, at a certain time, each person, attended by his family and friends,

marches in solemn silence, bearing the dead body of a son, a father, or a brother. These are deposited with reverence in the pit, from which each person takes a handful of the earth, which he preserves afterwards with the most religious care. Such a ceremony, though attended with strong marks of a rude and barbarous state of society, is yet characteristic of a people endowed, in no common degree, with strong, with humane, and generous feelings.

The animals of the continent of America, and its vegetable productions, were equally new, and remarkable as its inhabitants. The horse, the most valuable of our animals, was there totally unknown; nor had the Americans any of the larger animals, either wild or domestic, which are the natives of the other continents. The largest animal, which is known to be a native of America, is the taperette, which is not bigger than a calf of a year old. The chief vegetable productions which Europe has thence acquired are indigo, cocoa, vanilla, and, above all, the quinquina, that inestimable specific in intermitting disorders, which passes under the name of Peruvian bark. The cochineal insect, which furnishes the richest scarlet dye, is likewise a production of the continent of America.

The conduct of the Spaniards towards the inhabitants of these new-discovered countries, and the cruelties exercised by them under their first governors, furnish a subject which it were to be wished, for the honour of humanity, could be for ever veiled in oblivion. Religion and policy were the pretexts for the most outrageous acts

of inhumanity. Avarice, which the more it is fed is still the more insatiable, had suggested to some of these rapacious governors, that the inhabitants of the New World had discovered to the Spaniards but a very small proportion of treasures which were inexhaustible. The missionaries encouraged the idea, and insinuated, at the same time, that the most proper method of obtaining an absolūte authority over these new subjects, was to convert them to the doctrines of Christianity, for which purpose the priests were to be furnished with every authority sufficient for the extirpation of idolatory. The favourite instruments of conversion employed in these pious purposes were the rack and the scourge. While some, to escape these miseries, put an end to their life with their own hand, others, flying from their inhuman persecutors into the woods, were there hunted down with dogs, and torn to pieces like wild beasts. In a little time Hispaniola, which contained three millions of inhabitants, and Cuba, that had above six hundred thousand, were absolutely depopulated. Bartholomeo de las Casas, who was witness himself to those barbarities, an unsuccessful advocate in the cause of humanity, has drawn those enormities in such colours, as to form a picture of horror almost exceeding credibility.

In this situation were the islands of Cuba and Hispaniola, within the compass of a very few years from their first visitation by the Spaniards. The continent, as we have observed, was at this time no farther known than a little tract in the neighbourhood of the isthmus of Panama. An

expedition was now set on foot for extending the conquests of the Spaniards over the immense continent of America. Fernando Cortez, with a fleet of eleven vessels, and six hundred and seventeen men, embarked upon this expedition, and sailed from the island of Cuba in the year 1519. It was his good fortune to meet with a Spaniard, who had been detained for some years a prisoner upon the continent, and had thus learned the language of the Mexicans. He advanced into the country, which he found, beyond his expectation, extremely populous and civilised. The state of Tlascala made some attempts to resist his progress, but the arms of the Spaniards, and the dreadful effect of a few small pieces of artillery, very soon dispersed and reduced them to submission. Cortez, strengthened by an alliance which he formed with these Americans, proceeded towards the empire of Mexico. The city of Mexico, situated in the middle of a lake, was the noblest monument of American industry. The historians of the times have enlarged upon its extent, its riches, and magnificence. The Mexican empire had attained at this time (which was but an hundred and thirty years from its first foundation) to a very high pitch of grandeur. The people were of a warlike and enterprising disposition. The revenues of the monarch were considerable, and his authority unbounded.

Scarce had Cortez appeared upon the frontier, when a sudden consternation seized the whole empire, and paved the way for an easy conquest. The ships, the arms, the dress of the Spaniards

made the Americans regard them at first as beings of a superior nature. When Cortez arrived at the city of Mexico, he was received by the prince, Montezuma, with every mark of reverence and submission. A short stay, however, convinced the Mexicans that their invaders were men like themselves. A detached party of the Spaniards, who were on their way from Vera Cruz to Mexico, were attacked, by a secret order from Montezuma: three or four Spaniards were killed, and the emperor ordered their heads to be carried through the provinces, to destroy a belief which then prevailed among them that the Spaniards were immortal. The measures taken by Cortez, on the intelligence of this event, were singularly characteristic of his intrepid disposition. Attended with fifty Spaniards, he repaired instantly to the palace, and in the presence of the whole court, after sharply reproving Montezuma for this instance of perfidy to those who had behaved as friends and allies, he carried off the monarch prisoner to the Spanish camp. Here, after being obliged to abandon those who had been concerned in the attack at Vera Cruz to the vengeance of their enemies, the emperor himself was put in irons, and confined in a dungeon. The astonished Mexicans submitted to every term which was required of them; they agreed to the payment of an immense tribute of gold and precious stones, part of which Cortez set aside for his master the king of Spain, and appropriating part to himself, divided the rest among his soldiers.

Meantime, Velasquez, the governor of Cuba,

jealous of that success which he was informed had attended the Spanish arms in Mexico, sent an army of eight hundred men to supersede Cortez, and to assume the government of the country. This intrepid man, leaving his conquests to be secured by fourscore of his soldiers, attacked with the rest of his troops the army of Velasquez, defeated them and forced them to submit to his command as their general. At his return to Mexico, he found his Spaniards besieged in their quarter. The Mexicans had attempted to set at liberty their captive monarch, and on the sight of the Spanish army, pouring down upon them in immense numbers they attacked them with the most desperate fury. A horrible carnage ensued, which Montezuma himself endeavoured to put a stop to by offering himself as mediator between the Spaniards and the Americans. The pusillanimity of this proposal struck his own subjects with the highest indignation, and an enraged Mexican pierced him to the heart with a javelin. A new emperor was instantly created, a man of an heroic character, but who met with a fate still more deplorable than his predecessor. Under the command of this monarch, whose name was Guatimozin, all Mexico was armed against the Spaniards. Day after day, the Mexican armies were defeated. The Spaniards, for the loss of a man or two, generally revenged themselves with the blood of many hundreds. Unsuccessful by land, the Mexicans attempted to bring the Spaniards to a naval engagement. The lake was covered with some thousands of armed boats, the purpose of which was to destroy

a small fleet of brigantines, which, with the utmost apprehensions, the Mexicans had seen the Spaniards construct under the walls of their imperial city. This attempt proved equally unsuccessful with all the preceding. Their feeble armament of canoes was dispersed with such loss and slaughter, as convinced the Mexicans that the progress of the Europeans in knowledge and arts rendered their superiority greater on this new element than they had hitherto found it on land. In a following unsuccessful attempt, their Emperor Guatimozin fell into the hands of the Spaniards. He was taken, together with his queen, and some of the bravest and most faithful of his grandees, while crossing the lake in a small vessel. He went on board the Spanish commander with an air of dignity and composure, betraying neither fear nor surprise, and desired no favour but that the honour of his wife and her females might be spared. The Spanish captain attended but little to him, endeavouring to prevent the escape of the grandees; but Guatimozin desired him not to be anxious about them: "Not one of these brave men will fly (said he), do not fear it—*they* are come to die at the feet of their sovereign." He was treated at first with humanity, and every persuasive made use of to prompt him to make a discovery of the place where it was supposed he had concealed his treasures; but in vain. It was next tried what torture might produce, and by the command of one of the Spanish captains, the monarch, together with some of his chief officers, were stretched naked upon burning coals. While

Guatimozin bore the extremity of torment with more than human fortitude, one of his fellow-sufferers, of weaker constitution, turned his eyes upon his prince and uttered a cry of anguish: "Thinkest thou (said Guatimozin) that I am laid upon a bed of roses?" Silenced by this reproof, the sufferer stifled his complaints, and expired in an act of obedience to his sovereign. To the honour of Cortez, he was ignorant of this act of shocking inhumanity. He was no sooner apprised of what was doing than he hastened to rescue his noble captive while life yet remained; he kept him for three years a prisoner, till at last, discovering a formidable conspiracy that was set on foot by the prince for his release, and the destruction of the Spaniards, it was judged a necessary policy to put him to death.

The fate of Guatimozin was the last blow to the power of the Mexicans, and Cortez found himself absolute master of the whole empire.

The Spaniards, some years before this time, had ventured upon the South Seas in search of some new conquests. About the year 1527, Diego d'Almagro and Francis Pizarro, after sailing along the western coast for about three hundred leagues, landed in the empire of Peru with two hundred and fifty foot, sixty horse and twelve small pieces of cannon. The prince of the country, named Attabalipa, was of a race of sovereigns called the Incas. They possessed an empire greatly more extensive than that of Mexico, and surpassing it in magnificence and in internal riches. The Emperor Attabalipa, at the approach of the Spaniards, had drawn up his army near

the city of Quito. Pizarro began with offering terms of friendship, which being disregarded, he prepared himself for a hostile assault. A monk advanced in the front of the army, holding in his hand a bible, and told the Inca Attabalipa, by means of an interpreter, that it was absolutely necessary for his salvation, that he should believe all that was contained in that book. He then proceeded to set forth the doctrine of the creation, the fall of Adam, the incarnation of our Saviour, the redemption of man, the power of the apostles, and the transmission of their authority by succession to the pope of Rome, concluding with the donation made by this pope to Ferdinand and Isabella, the predecessors of the Emperor Charles V., of all the regions in the New World. In consequence of this clear deduction, he ordered the Inca immediately to embrace the Christian faith, acknowledge the pope's supremacy, and the lawful authority of the Emperor Charles V. This strange harangue excited equal astonishment and indignation. The Inca, however, deigned to take the book from the hands of the priest, and after eagerly looking at its characters, "Is *this* (says he) your authority? it is silent, it tells *me nothing*;" and with these words he threw it disdainfully upon the ground. The monk instantly summoned the Spaniards to avenge this impious profanation: they rushed upon the Peruvians with the most savage fury, and massacring all before them, till they arrived at the person of the Inca, they brought him off a prisoner to their camp, and loaded him with irons. The terror and dejection of the Peruvians

were extreme. The Inca promised an immense ransom to obtain his liberty, as much gold as would fill one of the halls of his palace. The promise was not performed in its utmost extent, and this disappointment exasperated his conquerors to such a degree, that the unfortunate Inca was condemned to the flames, with a promise of a mitigation of his punishment in case he should embrace the Christian religion. The terrors of a cruel death prevailed on Attabalipa to receive the sacrament of baptism; and immediately thereafter he was strangled at a stake. The same punishment was inflicted on several of the Peruvian chiefs, who, from a principle of generous magnanimity, chose rather to suffer death than disclose the treasures of the empire to its inhuman and insatiable invaders.

The courage of the Spaniards, however, and their enterprising genius, was equal to their inhumanity. Diego d'Almagro marched to Cuzco, through an extent of country where he met with continual opposition, and he even penetrated as far as Chili, two degrees south of the tropic of Capricorn. In Cuzco, a civil war broke out between him and his associate Francis Pizarro, and what is scarcely to be believed, the Peruvians, instead of profiting by these discords to revenge the injuries of their country, divided themselves between the two parties, and fought against each other under the standards of their tyrants. D'Almagro was taken prisoner, and beheaded by order of his rival Pizarro, who was himself assassinated soon after, by some of the party of his antagonist.

During this civil war were discovered the mines of Potosi, with which the Peruvians themselves had been unacquainted; a source of riches which to this day is not exhausted. The Peruvians were made to work at these mines for the Spaniards, as the real proprietors. Those slaves who, from constitutional weakness of body, were soon worn out by the dreadful fatigues which they underwent without the smallest remission of their labours, were replaced by negroes from the coast of Africa, who were transported to Peru as beasts of burden of a hardier species.

The policy of Spain with regard to her American colonies is explained at large with great accuracy and ingenuity by Robertson. It is sufficient here to give a general idea of it. The establishments of the Spaniards in the New World, though fatal to its ancient inhabitants, were made at a period when that monarchy was capable of forming them to the best advantage. Spain, by the union of its kingdoms under Ferdinand and Isabella, had become a very powerful state. The increase of the dominions of an empire naturally tends to increase the powers of the monarch; for in every wide-extended empire the government must be simple and the authority absolute, that his resolutions may be taken with promptitude, and pervade the whole with undiminished force. Such was the power of the Spanish monarchs, when they were called to deliberate concerning the mode of establishing their dominion over the extent of their new territories. With regard to these they found themselves under no constitutional restraint: they

issued edicts and laws for modelling the government of these colonies by a mere act of prerogative. This was very far from being the case with regard to the other European nations, the Portuguese, the English, and the French: and the difference was in a great measure owing to the very inconsiderable advantages which these infant colonies promised to their European masters, and which, therefore, were sufficient to make the state watch over them as a valuable object of attention.

The great maxim of the Spanish jurisprudence with regard to America was to hold the acquisitions in that country to be rather vested in the crown than in the state. The papal bull of Alexander VI. bestowed as an absolute donation upon Ferdinand and Isabella all the regions that had been, or might be, discovered in the New World. It was natural, therefore, that the sovereign should have the absolute regulation of what had been conferred on him as a right of property. In everything, therefore, which relates to the government of the Spanish colonies, the will of the sovereign was a law, the revenues his own, and the officers and magistrates in his sole nomination.

Soon after the acquisition of those territories, they were divided by the Spanish monarch into two immense governments, each under the administration of a viceroy, one of whom commanded in Mexico or New Spain, and the other in the empire of Peru. The inconvenience and hardships which had flowed from the subjection of such immense tracts of country to a governor

whose residence was necessarily at a distance from a great part of the provinces under his jurisdiction, occasioned the establishment of the third viceroy, whose command extended over the whole tract denominated Terra Firma, and the province of Quito. These viceroys possessed the regal prerogatives in their utmost extent. They exercised supreme authority in every department of government, civil and military. By them, or by the king of Spain, the conduct of civil affairs in the various provinces and districts was committed to magistrates of different orders, who were responsible to the jurisdiction of the viceroy. There were eleven audiences or tribunals for the administration of justice in causes civil and criminal; and in order to check that inconvenience and grievance which might result from the supreme authority of one man pervading every department of the administration, the viceroys were prohibited from interfering in the judicial proceedings of any of these courts of audience, which, on the other hand, were even entitled to examine and take cognizance of his political regulations, in some particular cases in which any question of civil right was involved. The jurisdiction of the audiences however was final only in questions where the property in dispute did not exceed 600 pieces of eight, or 825*l.* sterling: should it exceed that sum, their decisions were subject to review, and might be carried, by appeal, before the royal council of the Indies.

In this great council was vested the supreme government of all the Spanish dominions in

America. Its jurisdiction extended to every department, ecclesiastical, civil, military, and commercial. All laws and ordinances must receive its approbation. To it each person employed in America, from the viceroy downward, was accountable. From the first institution of this council, it had been the constant object of the Catholic monarchs to maintain its authority, and to render it formidable to all the subjects in the New World. For the regulation of commercial affairs, a tribunal was established in Spain, called Casa de la Contratacion, which may be considered both as a board of trade, and as a court of judicature. It regulated the departure of the fleets for the West Indies, the freight and burden of the ships, their equipment and destination. In these departments its decisions were exempted from the review of any court but that of the council of the Indies.

Such are the great outlines of that system of government which Spain established in her American colonies.

The gold and silver mines of that continent were, at first, of no use but to the kings of Spain and to the merchants; but by degrees the circulation of these metals was more equally distributed, and the value of specie diminished all over Europe very nearly in the same proportion. The means by which this circulation was produced are not difficult to be accounted for. The enterprises of Charles V. made a large distribution of the Spanish gold into Germany and Italy. The marriage of his son Philip with Queen Mary of England brought a great acquisition

of treasure into that country; and the wars of Philip in the Netherlands are said to have cost him above three thousand millions of livres.—Notwithstanding likewise the most severe prohibitions of the kings of Spain, precluding all other nations from any share of commerce with Spanish America, a most extensive trade has, from those times down to the present, subsisted between the Spanish ports and most of the kingdoms of Europe, even through the medium of the Spaniards themselves. The fact is, the wants of her colonies in America could not be supplied by her home productions or exports. These must be furnished by other nations, but as it was still through the medium of Spanish merchants, even this violatiou of their laws contributed, in effect, very considerably to their profit and emolument.

The example of the Spaniards, who were supposed to derive much more substantial advantages from their possessions in the New World than they have actually done, had roused the jealousy of the other European nations, and excited a desire to participate with them in the riches of this immense tract of inhabited country. Under Henry II. of France, the successor of Francis I., a project was set on foot in the year 1557, by the Admiral Coligni, to form an establishment upon the coast of Brazil, where the Portuguese had already settled themselves from the beginning of the century. The expedition embarked, but it was torn by intestine divisions, and was soon utterly destroyed by the Portuguese, who possessed themselves of almost the whole of

Brazil, one of the richest and most flourishing establishments in all America.

In North America, the Spaniards were already in possession of that peninsula now termed Florida, to which the French likewise pretended a right, from the circumstance of one of their cruizers having touched there much about the same time. To make good these pretensions, Coligni again sent out a colony in the year 1564, which, as the former had been ruined by the Portuguese, was now cut to pieces and annihilated by the Spaniards. The French, some years afterwards, notwithstanding these unsuccessful attempts, fitted out, principally at the charges of a private mercantile company, a small fleet, with which they established a colony in Canada, with a view to a trade of furs. There the city of Quebec was founded in the year 1608, at that time a collection of insignificant huts, and which only since the beginning of the last century has begun to figure among the towns of North America. A few Jesuits, and some protestants whom accident attracted to that country, contributed to the cultivation of this infant colony, which, however, continually suffered from the depredations of the Indians and from the attacks of the English. The French were so completely overpowered, that about the year 1629 they had not a foot of territory upon the continent of America. Cardinal Richelieu, however, at the instigation of those merchants who had suffered by the loss of the Canadian colony, stipulated, in the treaty of Saint Germains, that it should be restored to the French. The country remained for some time

in a miserable condition, and was again retaken by the English in the year 1654; since this period it has changed its master no less than six times, and is now in the hands of the British.

The most profitable and important possessions which the French ever acquired in the Western hemisphere were, the half of the island of St. Domingo, Guadaloupe, Martinico, with some of the small islands of the Antilles.

England derived right to her settlements in North America from the first discovery of the country by Sebastian Cabot, in the reign of Henry VII., about six years after the discovery of South America by Columbus. At that time North America was in general denominated Newfoundland, a name which is only retained by a large island on the coast of Labrador. The first attempt to plant colonies in North America was not till near a century after this period, under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when Sir Walter Raleigh founded the settlement of Virginia, so named in honour of the sovereign. The colony of Nova Scotia was planted some years afterwards by James I.; and New England was not the resort of any British subjects, till the religious dissensions in the beginning of the reign of Charles I. drove many who were disaffected to the worship of the national church, and sought an unrestrained liberty of conscience, to transplant themselves into that province. New York and Pennsylvania were in the hands of the Dutch till they were conquered by the English, in the reign of Charles II., when, in reward of the services of Admiral Penn, a gift

of the latter was made to his son, the famous William Penn the quaker. He obtained for his followers a valuable charter of privileges, which, reserving the sovereignty to the crown, allowed to the subject the utmost latitude of civil and religious liberty. Maryland was peopled during the reign of Charles I. by English Roman catholics, as New England had been by the puritans; but the bulk of the inhabitants are now protestants. The Carolinas were settled in the reign of Charles II. Georgia was not colonised till the middle of the eighteenth century, in the reign of George II. The Floridas were ceded to Britain by the treaty of peace in 1763.

CHAPTER XXII.

Age of Leo X.—State of the Arts under the Goths—Revival in Italy—Cimabue—Academy for painting instituted at Florence, 1350—Michel Angelo, Raffaelle, and Leonardo da Vinci—The different Italian Schools—Flemish School—Dutch Statuary and Architecture—Art of Engraving.

In enumerating those great features in the history of the progress of the human mind, which exhibited themselves at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, we remarked the high advancement to which the fine arts attained in Europe, in the age of Leo X.

There are periods in which the human genius seems to turn strongly to one peculiar direction. In one period the reasoning faculty seems chiefly to delight in contemplating its own powers, the nature and operations of the mind; in another, perhaps the imagination reigns predominant, and the general taste is attracted to works of fancy in poetry or romance. In another era the mechanic or the useful arts engross the general attention, and are cultivated with high success; in a fourth, as in the period of which we now treat, the popular taste, delighted with the contemplation of beautiful forms, bestows its chief

attention on the fine arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture.

The causes which give the bent or direction to the general taste, and consequently operate in the production of artists, or men eminent in the several departments of literature, sciences, and the arts, are not easily ascertained. That a great deal is owing to the operation of moral causes, I believe is certain; but I doubt greatly if they alone are sufficient to account for this remarkable distinction, of eras favourable and unfavourable for particular arts and sciences. By moral causes, I mean such as the following:—the peaceful or happy situation of a country; the genius or taste of a prince, directed to one particular department of science or of art, together with a liberal disposition to encourage those who are eminent in that department; the accidental circumstance of a few illustrious men contributing by their favour to bring artists into observation and repute, and by their example promoting a fashionable relish for their productions. To these we may add, what, perhaps, has no less influence, the aid derived by one artist from the studies of another; and the emulation that naturally takes place among all the professors of an art, where there are one or two of distinguished excellence.

These causes have unquestionably a very great influence in rendering certain periods more or less favourable than others; and we may observe, in general, with regard to the fine arts, that, in order to their advancement, a state of society is required, wherein [illegible] can employ

N. Y. FREE CIRCULATING LIBRARY
BLOOMINGDALE BRANCH

more attention on their pleasures than on their wants. The nation which enjoys peace and security, and where a great proportion of the people possess such a degree of wealth as to exempt them from laborious occupation, is the true soil for these arts to grow and flourish; and where any of the causes before-mentioned join their operation, still more if all, it is not surprising that, under such advantages, they should attain a very high degree of perfection.

Yet still I am inclined to doubt if even all these concurring are sufficient to account for this phenomenon in its full extent. In the first place, we find that history shows many periods where most of these causes, sometimes all, have concurred, yet the effect has not resulted. Princes have inherited a taste for the fine arts, and lavished their rewards upon indifferent artists. Nations have enjoyed peace, and ease, and opulence, and individuals have sought with eagerness the productions of art of other countries and of other ages, because their own age and country was barren. In the next place, we find that, in those golden ages of the arts, the transition from a bad to a good taste, from obscurity to splendour, was so rapid and instantaneous, as not at all to resemble the slow and gradual operation of moral causes. In those ages the torch of genius seems to have dropped at once from heaven, and to have kindled all in a blaze around it.

In the period of ancient history, we have seen that remarkable splendour to which the fine arts arose in the age of Pericles. In

modern times the age of Leo X. is an era equally distinguished.

The art of painting lay long buried in the west, under the ruins of the Roman empire. It declined in the latter ages with the universal decay of taste and genius, and needed not an irruption of the Goths to lay it in the dust. The Ostrogoths, who subdued Italy, that people who were barbarians only in name, had they found it in splendour, would have industriously cherished and preserved it, as they did every monument of ancient grandeur or of beauty: but painting and sculpture were never high among the ancient Romans; and that the taste and genius for the imitative arts underwent a regular and natural decay, we have the strongest proof in examining the series of the coins of the lower empire.

Such of the arts as were found by the Goths, upon the conquest of Italy, were carefully preserved by them. Muratori, in treating of those ages, informs us, that Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, about the year 592, built a palace, in which she made paintings be put up, representing the heroic actions of the Lombards. That paintings were used in the churches under the Gothic monarchy in Spain, in a very early period, we know from one of the canons of the council of Eliberi, held in the year 305, which prohibits them as idolatrous.

Instead of extinguishing and suppressing, there is even a probability that the Goths were the improvers, if not the actual inventors, of some of the arts dependent on design. A collection of

receipts are given by Muratori, from an ancient manuscript, written in the most barbarous Latin, —from which, however, it is evident that the Goths, at that time, possessed a pretty extensive knowledge in the ornamental arts, particularly in that of the composition of mosaic. That they possessed taste and genius I will not pretend to assert. It is even probable that that mechanical knowledge which showed itself in those ages was in the subsequent times greatly diminished. The fine arts are said to have been revived in Italy by artists from Greece; and it seems highly probable that in that country, which had been eminently distinguished by their splendour and perfection, the taste should have been less entirely lost than in any other.

The most common notion is, that, about the end of the thirteenth century, Cimabue, a Florentine, observing the works of two Grecian artists who had been sent for to paint one of the churches at Florence, began to attempt something of the same kind, and soon conceived that it would not be difficult to surpass such rude performances. His works were the admiration of his time; he had his scholars and his imitators, among these were Ghiotto, Gaddi, Tasi Cavallini, and Stephano Florentino; and the number of artists continued so to increase, that an academy for painting was instituted at Florence in the year 1350.

Still, however, the art was extremely low, and the artists, with great industry, seem to have had no spark of genius. The successors of Cimabue and of Ghiotto seem all to have painted in one

manner. Their works are distinguished by a hard and rigid outline, sharp angles of the limbs, and stiff folds in the drapery; a contour, in short, in which there is not the smallest grace or elegance. Such, with little variation or improvement, was the manner of painting for above two centuries. The best artists valued themselves on the most scrupulous and servile imitation of nature, without any capacity of distinguishing her beauties and deformities. In painting a head, it was the highest pitch of excellence that all the wrinkles of the skin should be most distinctly marked, and that the spectator should be able to count every hair on the beard. Such was the state of painting till towards the end of the fifteenth century, when all at once, as if by some supernatural influence, it attained at a single step to the summit of perfection.

Nothing can more clearly demonstrate that the splendour to which the fine arts all at once attained, at the period of which we now speak, was owing entirely to natural genius, and not to accidental causes, than this circumstance, that though many remains of the finest sculpture of the ancients existed, and were known in Italy for some centuries preceding this era, it was not till this time that they began to serve as models of imitation. Ghiotto, Cimabue, and their scholars, had seen some of the ancient statues, and many antique basso-relievos met the eye in almost every street in Rome; but they had looked on them with the most frigid indifference: the case was, they found in them nothing conformable to their own miserable taste. These

works now began to be regarded with other eyes. Michel Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, and Raffaelle arose, men animated with the same genius that had formed the Grecian Apelles, Zeuxis, Phidias, Glycon and Praxiteles.

And the prodigy was not confined to Rome: Florence, Venice, and other cities of Italy, produced in the same period many genuises self-taught like them, who left at an infinite distance all that had gone before them in the path of the arts. Nor was that genius even peculiar to Italy: Germany, Flanders, and Switzerland produced in the same age artists whose works are yet the admiration of Europe. Of these we shall speak in their turn, after having shortly characterised the greatest of the Italian masters, and the several schools of which the different merits are distinct and peculiar.

As the most ancient, and not the least remarkable of these, the school of Florence deserves to be first mentioned. Of this, the first of the great painters was Michel Angelo Buonarotti, born in the year 1474, whose works attracting the notice of Pope Julius II., he was called from Florence to Rome, where he has left in the pontifical palace and in the churches some of the most sublime specimens of his art. A most profound intelligence of anatomy, and a skill in design, formed upon the contemplation of the ancient sculptures, characterise the works of Michel Angelo. He understood most perfectly the human figure, but delighted too much to display his knowledge by exhibiting it in forced and violent attitudes. The subjects of his paintings

are happily chosen to exhibit the grand, the sublime, and even the terrible; but he is ignorant of the beautiful. The strength with which he characterises the muscles of the human body, and the violent fore-shortenings of limbs, are suitable to the persons of heroes, demi-gods, and devils, and these he has most happily represented; but his women are as muscular as the ordinary race of men, and his men are too much beyond nature*. Michel Angelo seemsto have studied the human body divested of the skin, where the beginning and termination of the muscles are distinctly seen, and their separation marked by strong lines.

The paintings of Michael Angelo are models of design; they are drawn with infinite skill, and to a young artist might almost supersede the imitation of the human figure, and the knowledge of anatomy; but they will not supply the place of the antique: for from that fountain Michel Angelo has adopted nothing else but skill and correctness of outline, without aiming at the attainment of grace or beauty; that was reserved for Raffaelle.

The Roman school owed its origin to Raffaelle, who was born at Urbino, in the year 1483. He soon departed from the dry manner of his master Perugino, and formed to himself one peculiarly his own, in which he has wonderfully united

* The merit of Michel Angelo was never more truly or forcibly expressed than by a Frenchman, the sculptor Falconet, who, after viewing two of his statues, observed—"J'ai vu Michel Ange—il est effrayant."

almost every excellence of the art. His invention and composition are admirable, his attitudes grand and sublime, his female figures in the highest degree beautiful. He understood the anatomy of the human figure as well as Michel Angelo, but he never offends by a harsh delineation of the muscles. His skill in the *chiaroscuro*, or in the effect of light and shade, is beyond that of Michel Angelo, and his colouring very far superior to him. In the action of his figures there is nothing violent and constrained, but all is moderate, simple, and gracefully majestic. Many painters there are, excellent in different departments, and several that, in one single department, may be found to exceed even Raffaelle; but in that supreme excellence which consists in the union of all the various merits of the art, he stands unrivalled, and far removed from all competition.

In the article of female beauty, Raffaelle has gone beyond every other artist, and even beyond the antique itself. In his Madonnas, in his St. Cecilia, and in his Galatea, imagination cannot reach a finer conformation of features. In painting the Galatea, he says himself in one of his letters, that, unable to find among the most beautiful women that excellence which he aimed at, he made use of a certain divine form or idea which presented itself to his imagination *.

In his portraits, he seems to have confined himself to the perfect imitation of nature, without desire to raise or embellish, but without that

* See Bellori, Descriz. delle imagine da Raff. d'Urbino.

minute and servile accuracy which distinguishes the works in that style of some of the Flemish masters.

The union of all these excellences, which has placed Raffaelle at the head of all the painters that ever the world produced, was attained by a youth who never reached the middle period of life. Raphael died at the age of thirty-seven. What may we suppose he would have been had he lived to the age of Titian or Leonardo da Vinci?

The school of Lombardy, or the Venetian school, arose in the same age; of which the most eminent artists were Titian, Giorgione, Correggio, and Parmegiano. Titian, by the strength of genius alone, and with much fewer advantages than Michel Angelo or Raffaelle, attained to a very high degree of excellence. The praise of Titian in painting the human body is, that it is nature itself. In portrait, therefore, he particularly excelled, and, above all, in the representation of female beauty. Without an extreme brilliancy, there is such propriety and truth in his colouring, that his naked figures seem animated flesh. His historical pieces are not numerous: perhaps he wanted invention, and did not excel in composition; but in the introduction of a few figures, he often unites the grace and dignity of Raffaelle. Leo X., who wished to make Rome the centre of all excellence in the fine arts, would have tempted Titian thither with very splendid offers. He was invited at the same time by Francis I. to reside in France, and by Henry VIII. to the court of

England. The Emperor Charles V. bestowed on him the highest honours and rewards. But Venice was the residence which he chose; and wherever he himself might remain, he knew that his works would find their way over all Europe. To the merit of Titian there can be no higher testimony than that of Michel Angelo, who declared, that had it been his fortune to have studied at Rome or Florence, amid the great masterpieces of antiquity, he would have eclipsed all the painters in the world.

Giorgione, the rival of Titian, of the same school, had he lived, might have attained perhaps to equal reputation, but he died at the age of thirty-three. Titian lived to the age ~~of one hundred~~ 99.

Of the same Venetian school, and contemporary with these, were Correggio and Parmegiano. The art of colouring, though carried to a great height by Raffaelle and by Titian, was not brought to perfection. Correggio, in this respect, was superior to all that preceded, perhaps all that have followed him. The effect of light and shade, though often eminently conspicuous in the works of Raffaelle and of Titian, seems in these painters to be frequently accidental; as in some of their paintings it is not at all striking. But in Correggio it was the result of study, and was always surprising. From this intimate knowledge of the power of colours artfully contrasted, and the effect arising from a judicious distribution, of strong lights and shades, the pictures of Correggio are perhaps more generally pleasing than those of any other painter. Divestedof these and

considered only in the outline or design, they are not possessed of consummate merit. In that particular Raffaelle and Michel Angelo are so infinitely superior as to be beyond all comparison with other painters.

Francesco Parmegiano had so thoroughly adopted the graceful manner of Raffaelle, that it was said the soul of that great painter had, after his death, found itself a new body. But the figures of Parmegiano, though highly graceful, have often a degree of affectation: *his* is that grace which is the result of study, whereas in Raffaelle it is the result of ease and nature. His taste perhaps might have become more chaste and simple as he advanced in years, but he died at the age of thirty-six. These three—the Florentine, the Roman, and the Venetian—are the chief of the Italian Schools of painting. The Florentine is distinguished by grandeur and sublimity, and great excellence of design; but a want of grace, of beauty of colouring, and skill in the *chiaro-oscuro*. The character of the Roman is equal excellence of design, a grandeur tempered with moderation and simplicity, a high degree of grace and elegance, and a superior knowledge, though not an excellence, in colouring. The characteristic of the Venetian is the perfection of colouring, and the utmost force of the *chiaro-oscuro*, with an inferiority in every other particular.

These original schools gave birth to many others. To the school of Raffaelle succeeded that of the Caraccis, which may be termed the second Roman school. The Caraccis were three

brothers, all of them eminent in their art, but of whom Annibal was the most excellent. He left many scholars of great reputation, as Guercino, Albano, Lanfranc, Domenichino, and Guido. Guercino distinguished himself by a graceful and very correct design: the airs of his heads are admirable. Albano painted nymphs, goddesses, and Cupids, with great beauty and delicacy, and in a most pleasing style of colouring: the landscape of his pieces is in general extremely fine. Lanfranc painted chiefly in fresco, and with great force and beauty. Domenichino excelled in character and expression, and Guido in strength and sweetness, with which he united a great deal of majesty. His colouring, however, is in general cold and unpleasant, unless in the famous picture of the Aurora, where he has given all the splendour of colouring which the subject required.

In the age of Leo X. the Flemish school likewise produced its masters, who, though in a different style, and very inferior to the Italian, had, like them, taken a very surprising stretch beyond the abilities of their predecessors. Nature was the prototype of the Flemish, and the antique that of the Italians. John Van Eyk, a Fleming, had, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, found out (or at least greatly improved) the manner of tempering the colours with oil instead of water; and this invention, which gave to painting a greater durability, as well as a warmth more approaching to nature, was very soon adopted by the artists both of Flanders, of Germany, and of Italy. In Flanders,

Heemskirk, Martin Vos, Frans Florus, and Quintin Matsys, were deservedly distinguished. In Germany, Albert Durer raised the reputation of the art of painting, which in that country was till then extremely low. Without the least conception of the beauties of the antique, this artist, by ability in design and skilfulness of composition, has produced some wonderful pieces. In his heads there is something uncommonly excellent; but the bodies of his figures are lean, weak, and ungraceful; and we seldom find in any of his works a happy effect of light and shade: yet in this painter there was so much of an original genius, that Raffaelle himself admired and valued his productions.

Among the Flemish painters, such at least as were so by nation, Rubens has unquestionably attained the highest rank. He studied with perfect intelligence the ancient models, as well as the works of the best of the Italian artists: but such is the force of a natural and constitutional taste, that his figures, though eminently beautiful, are of that style of beauty which is peculiar to his own country. To the eye of an Italian the female figures of Rubens are too corpulent to be graceful; to us they are less exceptionable, because they approach nearer to that style of figure with which we are accustomed. In point of drawing, intelligence of anatomy, and the use of the muscles, Rubens is supremely excellent.

Switzerland, too, in this remarkable age, produced a painter of uncommon excellence; this was Hans Holbein. The latter pieces of this artist, probably painted after he had seen some

of the works of the schools of Italy, are extremely pleasing. Holbein excelled in the knowledge of the *chiaro-oscuro*, and was an able colourist.

England, it would appear, at this time, had begun to manifest a taste in the fine arts. Erasmus, the friend of Holbein, persuaded that painter to travel to England, as the best field of encouragement for his merit. There the painter lived for many years in high favour with Henry VIII. and the chancellor Sir Thomas More. He was a most industrious artist; and there are at this day more of the works of Holbein in Britain, than in any other country of Europe.

Holland had likewise at this time its remarkable painters, of whom the chief merit was a most accurate representation of nature, but without any selection of the beautiful from the deformed; and often with a preference for the low, vulgar, and ludicrous. It is such nature, however, as is suited to the generality of tastes, for there are but a few who have a real feeling for the sublime and beautiful.

With the art of painting, those of sculpture and architecture were likewise revived and brought to high perfection. In sculpture, Michel Angelo stands unrivalled among the moderns. He has produced some works which are even equal to the antique. His statue of Bacchus is so exquisitely formed as to have deceived even Raffaelle, who judged it to be the work of Phidias or Praxiteles. But of all the sculptors of modern times, no other artist has approached near to the merit of the antique, nor have there been, in that depart-

ment, an equal number who excelled as in painting. No position certainly can be worse founded than that of the Abbé du Bos, who maintains that to excel in sculpture does not require so great a degree of genius as to be eminent in painting. That this notion is erroneous, there cannot be a stronger proof than the comparative numbers of eminent painters and sculptors. For the one capital sculptor in the age of Leo, who was Michel Angelo, there existed ten capital painters.

The age of Leo was, likewise, the era of a good taste in architecture. The Grecian mode of architecture, which for many ages sunk entirely into neglect, while the Gothic was universally prevalent, began gradually to recover about the beginning of the fourteenth century. The Florentines, from their commercial voyages into the Levant, and intercourse with Greece, were the first who re-established the Grecian architecture in Italy. The church of St. Miniato, which was built at Florence in the year 1300, showed the first specimen of the renewed architecture of the ancients. The cathedral of Pisa, built soon after, was constructed by Buschetto, a Grecian architect, who introduced into it some entire columns which had been brought from the ruins of some of the ancient temples in Greece. This magnificent building served as a model for many others constructed in Italy about the same time.

From this period, architecture continued slowly advancing for about two centuries, till it was brought to great perfection in the age of Leo. Bramante, who had carefully studied all the best

remains of the ancient buildings in Italy, had been chosen by Julius II. to design the plan of St. Peter's church, and upon his plan that immense and noble structure was begun. It was afterwards superintended by different artists of great eminence, by San Gallo, by Raffaelle, and by Michel Angelo, and was varied probably by each of these in many particulars from its original plan.

Verona likewise, remarkable for some of the most entire and noblest monuments of ancient building, particularly its great amphitheatre, produced in this age many excellent architects—Jocondo, who raised several noble buildings for Lewis XII. of France; San Michael, who adorned his native city with some works in the true manner of antiquity, as did likewise Maria Falconetti. But all yielded to the universal genius of Michel Angelo, who, equally eminent in all the works of design, painting, sculpture, and architecture, applied himself in the latter part of his life chiefly to architecture. The church of St. Peter's owes to him its greatest beauty; and as that building is deservedly esteemed one of the most perfect models of architecture in the world, we must thence conclude Michel Angelo to have been one of the greatest architects.

In treating of the state of the fine arts in the age of Leo X., the art of engraving deserves to be particularly taken notice of, as one of the finest of the modern inventions, and of which the first discovery was but a few years prior to the period of which we now treat. The Italians, the Germans, the Flemish, and the Dutch, have

all contended for the honour of this invention. The opinion best founded is that engraving had its origin in Italy. Tomaso Finiguerra, a goldsmith of Florence, about the year 1460, discovered the method of taking off impressions from engraved silver plates with wet paper, which he pressed upon them with a roller. Andrea Mantigna, a painter, bethought himself of multiplying by that means copies of his own designs. From Italy the art travelled into Flanders, where it was first practised by Martin Schoen of Antwerp, of whose works there remain a very few prints, which are the most ancient engravings now known.

His scholar was the celebrated Albert Durer, who far surpassed his master in abilities. He engraved with excellence in copper and in wood, and of his pieces a very great number have reached the present time. Considered as the first efforts of a new art, they have great merit. In some of those prints which he executed on silver and on copper, the engraving is elegant to a great degree. The immediate successors of Albert Durer were Lucas of Leyden, Aldegrave, and Sebald Behem, or Hisbens, who all engraved very much in the manner of Albert. In Italy, at the same time, Parmegiano had begun to etch some of his own beautiful designs, and is, by many, supposed to have been the inventor of the mode of engraving by means of aquafortis, which expresses the design of the artist with much greater freedom and spirit than the laboured stroke of the graver, though its lines have

less softness and delicacy; a combination of the two is, therefore, most happily employed by the modern artist, and is productive of an excellent effect, especially in landscape. In Italy, likewise, Mark Antonio and Agostino, contemporaries of Parmegiano, were successfully employed in making engravings from the works of Raffaelle. These engravings were then much sought after, and are yet in request on account of their antiquity; but in point of merit, and as giving an idea of the beauties of the original, they have been infinitely surpassed by the works of posterior engravers.

There is no art whatever, which from its first discovery has undergone so rapid an improvement as that of engraving. When we compare the prints of Albert Durer, or of Lucas of Leyden, with those of Goltzius, engraved about seventy years after, the difference is perfectly astonishing. But when we come down about eighty years farther, and examine the prints of Poilly, Audran, and Edelinck, we are ready to acknowledge a proportional improvement. From that time to the present, in some respects the advancement has been equally sensible, though in others not so apparent. It must be readily confessed that the landscapes of Woollet are greatly superior to those of Bolowert, Saddeler, and Bloemart; but it is a little doubtful whether the historical pieces of Strange, of Bartolozzi and Cunego, surpass those of Poilly, Edelinck, and Treij. This superiority has been achieved by Raphael Morghen.

The moderns, who have carried the use of the graver to a very great height, and have confessedly much improved in the art of etching, have now laid aside one mode of engraving practised by the ancient artists, and brought by them to a very great degree of perfection—engraving in wood with different tints, which was performed by different plates. The inventor of this art was Ugo da Carpi, an Italian; and it was brought to great perfection by Andrea Andreani, of Mantua. The spaces of white and the washes of which the middle tint is composed, give to these prints all the softness of drawing; and some experiments have been made in the same way with different colours, which give these performances in some degree the effect of painting.

As I shall not have another opportunity of particularly mentioning the arts dependent on design, it would be improper to quit the subject without taking notice of a mode of engraving different from all those I have mentioned, though its invention belongs to a period considerably later than that of which we now treat: I mean the mode of engraving in mezzo-tinto. It was invented by the celebrated Prince Rupert, son of the Elector Palatine, about the year 1650; and the hint was conceived from observing the effect of rust upon a soldier's fusil, in covering the surface of the iron with innumerable small holes at regular distances. Rupert, who was a great mechanical genius and virtuoso, concluded that a contrivance might be found to

cover a plate of copper with such a regular ground of holes so closely pierced as to give a black impression, which if scraped away in proper parts, would leave the rest of the paper white; that thus light and shade might be as finely blended, or as strongly distinguished, as by the pencil in painting. He tried the experiment by means of an indented steel roller, and it succeeded to his wishes. A crenulated chisel is now used to make the rough ground in place of the roller. This art has been brought to very high perfection. Its characteristic is a softness equal to that of the pencil, and it is therefore particularly adapted to portraits; and nothing except the power of colours can express flesh more naturally, the flowing of hair, the folds of drapery, or the reflection from polished surfaces. Its defect is, that where there is one great mass of shade in the picture, it wants an outline to detach and distinguish the different parts, which are thus almost lost in one entire shade; but in the blending of light and shade there is no other mode of engraving that approaches to it in excellence.

The age of Leo, though principally distinguished by the perfection of the arts of design, was likewise a period of very considerable literary splendour. Ariosto, Bembo, and Sadolet divided the favour of Leo and the esteem of the public with Raffaelle and Michel Angelo. Guicciardini in the same period rivalled the best historians of antiquity, and Machiavel shone equally in history, politics, philosophy, and poetry.

But the literary genius of this age will fall to be more particularly treated afterwards in giving a connected view of the progress of literature and of the arts and sciences from the beginning of the sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Survey of the State of the principal Kingdoms of Asia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries:—Selim reduces Egypt—Solyman takes Rhodes—subdues Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachia—Selim II. takes Cyprus—Battle of Lepanto—Persians under Shah-Abbas—Government and Religion—Tartars—India, early Particulars of—Aurungzebe—Brahmins—Divisions of Castes.

The Turks, we have seen, in the middle of the fifteenth century, subverted the empire of Constantinople, which from that period became the imperial seat of the Ottoman dominion. In treating of that great revolution, I took occasion to offer some considerations on the government and political constitution of the Turkish empire—that great fabric of despotism.

The Turks proceeded to extend their conquests. Mahomet II. subdued a great extent of territory. Selim I. added new conquests. In the year 1515, he made himself master of Syria and Mesopotamia, and undertook the reduction of Egypt, which was then in the possession of the Mamelukes, a race of Circassians who had been masters of that country ever since the last crusade. The arms of Selim put an end to their dominion; but, what is a very extraordinary

fact, he allowed the last of the Mameluke kings to govern Egypt in the quality of his bashaw; and these Mamelukes, though nominally under the dominion of the Grand Signior, continued in reality the sovereigns of the country, acknowledging but a very slender subjection to the Ottoman power.

Solyman, the son of Selim, who is termed Solyman the Magnificent, was a formidable enemy to the Christians and to the Persians. He took the island of Rhodes in the year 1521. The Knights of St. John were at this time in possession of this island, from which they had expelled the Saracens in 1310. They made a noble defence, assisted by the English, Italians, and Spaniards; but after a siege of many months were forced to capitulate. Solyman, a few years afterwards, subdued the greatest part of Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachia. He failed in his attempt upon Vienna; but turning his arms eastward against the Persians, he made himself master of Bagdad and subdued Georgia. He concluded a treaty of alliance with the French, which subsisted for two centuries. His son Selim II., in the year 1571, took the island of Cyprus from the Venetians; and this industrious people were carrying on a brisk trade with the Turks at the very time that they were making this conquest. Genoa, Florence, and Marseilles were rivals with Venice in the trade of Turkey, for the silks and commodities of Asia. It is remarkable that the Christian nations have traded with the Ottoman empire to a very large extent, without its ever having been known that a Turkish

vessel came into their ports for the purposes of commerce, in return for the vast fleets which they annually send to those of Turkey. All the trading nations of Christendom have consuls who reside in the sea-ports on the Levant, and most of them have ambassadors at the Ottoman Porte, while none are sent from thence to *reside* with other nations.

The Venetians, sensibly feeling the loss of Cyprus,—which, besides the advantages of its produce, was a most convenient *entrepôt* for their trade to the Levant,—and finding their own force insufficient for its recovery from the Turks, applied to Pope Pius V. for the benefit of a crusade. The pope gave them more effectual aid, by waging war himself against the Ottoman empire, and by entering into a league for that purpose both with the Venetians and with Philip II. of Spain, the son and successor of Charles V. Pius, who was a good politician and a great economist, had amassed, in the course of his pontificate, such wealth as to render the holy see a very formidable power. The wealth of Philip II. was considered at that time as inexhaustible. A great armament was immediately fitted out, consisting of two hundred and fifty ships of war, with fifty transports. Don John of Austria, brother of Philip, (a natural son of Charles V.) was admiral of the fleet. Historians compute that the number of men on board was fifty thousand. The fleet of the Turks, who had not been wanting in their preparations, consisted likewise of two hundred and fifty galleys. These powerful armaments met in the Gulf of Le-

panto, near Corinth, and an engagement ensued, more memorable than any naval fight that had happened since the battle of Actium. All the ancient and all the modern weapons of war were used in this sea-fight, which terminated to the honour of the Christians. The Turks lost above one hundred and fifty ships; the number of their slain is said to have been fifteen thousand, and among these was Ali, the admiral of their fleet, whose head was cut off and fixed upon the top of his flag*.

Don John of Austria acquired by this signal victory a very high degree of reputation, which was still heightened by the taking of Tunis, about two years after. But from these successes the Christians, after all, did not derive any lasting advantage; for Tunis was very soon recovered, and the Ottoman empire was as powerful as before. The Turks, after the death of Selim II., preserved their superiority both in Europe and in Asia. Under Amurath II. they extended the limits of their empire into Hungary on the one side, and into Persia on the other. Mahomet III., the successor of Amurath, began his reign like a monster, by strangling nineteen of his brothers, and drowning twelve of his father's concubines, on the supposition of their being pregnant. Yet this barbarian supported the dignity of the empire and extended its dominions. From his death, which was in the year 1603, the Ottoman power began to decline. The Persians at this period became

* In the battle of Lepanto, Cervantes, as he informs us in his inimitable romance of 'Don Quixote,' lost his left hand by the stroke of a Turkish sabre.

the predominant power in Asia, under Shah Abbas the Great, a prince who, in all his wars with the Turks, was constantly victorious. He gained from them many of their late acquisitions of territory; and effectually checking that career of success which had for several years attended their arms, he gave great relief to several of the princes of Europe, who at that time were scarcely able to defend their own dominions. Shah Abbas thus involuntarily shielded the European kingdoms from the fury of the Turkish arms, as we have seen that Tamerlane and Gengis Khan had formerly been, in an indirect manner, the protectors of Constantinople.

Persia, under Shah Abbas, was extremely flourishing. This vast empire had, some time before this period, experienced a revolution, somewhat similar to that which the change of religion produced in Europe. Towards the end of the fifteenth century a new sect was formed by a Persian named Sophi, and his opinions were eagerly embraced by a great part of his countrymen, merely from the circumstance of thus distinguishing themselves from the Turks, whom they hated. The principal difference seems to have been that the reformer Sophi held Ali, the son-in-law of Mahomet, to have been the legitimate successor of the prophet; whereas the Mahometans generally acknowledged Omar the prophet's lieutenant. Sophi fell a martyr to his opinions; for he was assassinated by some of the opposite sect, in the year 1499. His son Ismael maintained his father's doctrines by force of arms: he conquered and converted Armenia,

and subdued all Persia, as far as Samarcand; and he left this empire to his descendants, who reigned there peaceably till the revolutions in the last century. The Conqueror, Shah Abbas, was the great grandson of this Ismael Sophi.

The government of Persia is as despotic as that of Turkey; but there seems to be this substantial difference between the state of Turkey and of Persia, that the inhabitants of the latter enjoy their possessions with some security, for the payment of a small tax or land-rent to the government. The kings of Persia receive presents from their subjects, as the Grand Signior does; and according to Sir John Chardin's accdount, the king of Persia's new year's gifts amounted in those days to five or six millions to livres.

The crown of Persia is hereditary, with the exclusion of females from the succession; but the sons of a daughter are allowed to inherit the sovereignty. By the laws of Persia the blind are excluded from the throne. Hence it is a customary policy of the reigning prince to put out the eyes of all those of the blood royal of whom he has any jealousy.

The national religion of the Persians we have said is the Mahometan as reformed by Sophi. The slender difference of opinions between them and the Turks is the cause of an aversion much stronger than ever subsisted between the Protestants and Catholics. If a Persian were washing his hands in a river, he would conceive himself contaminated if he knew that a Turk had bathed in it. There are, however, various sects

of Mahometans in Persia; and some of these adopt not a few of the tenets of Christianity. The ancient religion of Zoroaster, too, is yet preserved among the Persians Guebres, who pretend in their temples to have kept alive the sacred fire from the days of the great founder of their religion down to the present time. Of the religion of Zoroaster we formerly gave a full account.

The language of the Persians is extremely beautiful, and peculiarly adapted to poetical composition. Sir William Jones has given to the public several beautiful translations from that language, which display the utmost luxuriance of fancy; and Mr. Richardson, in his curious dissertation on the languages, literature, and manners of the Eastern nations, has given a pretty full account of the learning of the Persians, who seem at one period (from the tenth to the thirteenth century) to have far surpassed in that respect the contemporary nations of Europe. The epic poet Firdousi, in his romantic history of the Persian kings and heroes, rivals Ariosto in luxuriancy of imagination, and is said to equal Homer in the powers of description. The writings of Sadi and of Hafiz, both in prose and in poetry, are to this day in high estimation with those who are conversant in Oriental literature.

The trade of Europe with Persia is carried on by the Gulf of Ormus, and by the way of Turkey. The chief manufactures of Persia are raw and wrought silks, mohair, camlets, carpets, and leather; for which the English merchants give woollen cloths in exchange. The sovereign of Persia is himself the chief merchant, and he

usually employs his Armenian subjects to traffic for his behoof in different quarters of the world. The agents of the king must have the refusal of all merchandise before his subjects are permitted to trade *.

To the north of Persia, that immense tract of country which is called Tartary had from time to time sent forth a succession of conquerors, who, carrying every thing before them, produced astonishing revolutions in the continent of Asia. We have formerly taken notice of the subversion of the empire of the Caliphs by this race of northern invaders. Mahmoud conquered Persia and a great part of India towards the end of the tenth century; Gengis Khan marched from the extremity of Tartary in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and subdued India, China, Persia, and Russia. Batoucan, one of the sons of Gengis, ravaged as far as the frontiers of Germany. Of the vast empire of Kapjac, which was the patrimonial inheritance of Batoucan, there remained in the last century no more than Crim Tartary, which till lately was possessed by his descendants under the protection of the Turks. Tamerlane, whose conquests we have already taken notice of, was of the same nation of the Tartars, and of the race of Gengis.

To the north of China were the Mongol and Mantchou Tartars, who made a conquest of this country under Gengis, and who professed that

* The history of Persia has now been made fully and accurately known to Europeans by the writings of General Sir John Malcolm, who died in 1833.—EDITOR.

religion, of which we shall presently speak, whose head is the Great Lama. Their territories again are bounded on the west by the of empire of Russia. A variety of different hordes wandering Tartars occupy the country extending from thence to the Caspian Sea. The Sultan Baber *, great grandson of Tamerlane, subdued the whole country that lies between Samarcand, in the territory of the Usbecs, and Agra, one of the capitals of the Mogul empire. At that time, India was divided between four principal nations—the Mahometan Arabians; the ancient Parsees or Guebres; the Tartars of Gengis Khan and Tamerlane; and, lastly, the real Indians in different castes or tribes.

The wandering Tartars follow at this day the life of the ancient Scythians. In the spring, a large body or horde, amounting perhaps to 10,000, sets out in quest of a settlement for the summer. They drive before them their flocks and herds; and when they come to an inviting spot, they live upon it till all its verdure is eaten up, and till the country supplies no more game for the chase. They exchange cattle with the Russians, the Persians, or the Turks, for money, with which they purchase cloth, silks, stuffs, and apparel for their women. They have the use of firearms, which they are very dexterous at making, and it is almost the only mechanical art which they exercise. They disdain every other species of labour, and account no employment to be honourable, unless that of hunting. It is cus-

* The curious Autobiography of Baber has recently been translated into English—EDITOR.

tomary with them, as it is likewise with the Canadian savages, that when a man, from age, is incapable of partaking in the usual occupation of his tribe, they build him a small hut upon the banks of a river, and giving him some provisions, leave him to die, without taking any further charge of him.

The mode of life for the Tartars during the winter season is for each family to burrow itself under ground; and it is said that, for the sake of social intercourse, they have subterraneous passages cut from one cabin to another, thus forming a sort of invisible town.

The inhabitants of Thibet, which is the most southern part of Tartary, do not follow the same wandering life with their northern brethren.

The religion and government of Thibet form one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the history of mankind. The kingdom of Thibet is governed by a young man personating a living god, who is called the Great Lama, or Dalai Lama. He resides in a pagoda or temple upon a mountain, where he is seen continually sitting in a cross-legged posture, without speaking or moving, except sometimes lifting his hand, when he approves of the addresses of his votaries. He appears to be a young man of a fair complexion, between twenty and thirty years of age. Not only the people of Thibet, but the neighbouring princes, resort to the shrine of the Lama, and bring thither the most magnificent presents. The Lama is both the national god and the sovereign. He appoints deputies under him, the chief of whom is called the Tipa, who manages

the temporal affairs of the kingdom, which it is beneath the dignity of the Lama ever to attend to. The creation of this prince, or god, is kept a most mysterious secret by the priests. When it is the misfortune of this poor image of divinity and sovereignty to fall sick, or to lose his youthful appearance, he is put to death by the priests, who have always another young man whom they have privately educated and properly trained to supply his place. Thus the religion of the Lama is nothing else than an artful contrivance of the priests of Thibet to engross to themselves the sovereignty and absolute government of the country.

To the south of Thibet lie those countries known both in ancient and in modern times by the name of India; though neither that term nor the word Hindoo are proper to the country, but seem to have been given to those regions and their inhabitants by the Persians. In the Sanscrit, or ancient language of India, the country is called Bharata; a name which has not been given to it by any other nation. The earliest accounts which any of the ancient writers have transmitted to us of this country are those of Herodotus, who wrote his history about a century before the time of Alexander the Great; and it is singular that his accounts, though on the whole very [illegible] and imperfect, represent the character [illegible] people and their manners precisely the same with those of the modern race of Hindoos. He takes notice of their living chiefly on rice, of their putting to death no animals, and clothing themselves with cotton. He informs

us that Darius Hystaspes, about the year 508 before Christ, had sent Scylax of Caryandra to explore the river Indus; but Scylax had not the good fortune to be believed in the accounts which he gave of his journey. By the expedition of Alexander the Great into India, the Greeks received the first authentic accounts of those countries which border upon the river Indus. It is certain that this great conqueror penetrated into that part of the country which is now called the Punjab. Here the extreme distress which his army sustained from the monsoons, or periodical rains which fall in that country at stated seasons of the year, gave rise to an obstinate determination of his troops to proceed no farther. Alexander, therefore, with much mortification, was obliged to fix here the limits of his conquests. He now embarked on the Hydaspes, which runs into the Indus, and pursuing his course down that great river for above a thousand miles, till it reaches the ocean, and subduing in his progress all the nations on both sides, he must have explored a great tract of the country of India. Of this expedition, his three officers, Ptolemy, Nearchus, and Aristobulus, kept exact journals, from which Arrian informs us that he compiled his history. The particulars given in those accounts relative to the manners of the people accord likewise entirely with all the modern accounts of the manners of the Hindoos.

After the death of Alexander, the Indian conquests of that monarch fell to the share of Seleucus, who made an expedition into the

country, and, it is probable, maintained at least a nominal sovereignty over it. From that time, however, for near two centuries, we hear no more of India from any of the Greek writers till the period of Antiochus the Great, who made a short expedition into that country, and asserted a species of dominion over some of the Indian princes, by forcing them to give him presents of money, and a number of elephants. The Greek empire of Bactria, it is probable, kept up an intercourse with the Indian countries in its neighbourhood; but from those times down to the end of the fifteenth century, no European power had any thought of establishing a dominion in India; the only intercourse which continued between the predominant powers of antiquity and that country being confined to the purposes of commerce. Egypt, during the time it was governed by the successors of Alexander, possessed exclusively the commerce of India, by means of the Red Sea. When Egypt fell under the dominion of the Romans, the commodities of India continued as usual to be imported to Alexandria, and from thence to Rome. When the seat of the empire was removed to Constantinople, that capital became, of course, the centre of Indian commodities. But it was not only by sea that the Roman empire maintained its communication with India. We perceive from the Geography of Ptolemy, who lived about two hundred years after the Christian era, that the route by land, across the desert, must have been at that time known; and we have, indeed, certain authority for the fact, that when the Romans

had extended their conquests as far as the Euphrates, finding the intercourse established by caravans, which travelled at stated seasons from those provinces to India, they took advantage of that communication to import the Indian merchandise over land.

Thus, then, from the age of Alexander down to the period of the Portuguese discovery of the route to India by the Cape of Good Hope, we have seen that a commercial intercourse had subsisted between that country and Europe, both by sea and land. It is, however, only since the period of that important discovery that the country of India has become familiarly known to us, and all the wonders of the Indian policy and system of manners laid open; which prove that great nation to have been perhaps the most early civilised, or at least, in remote periods, the most refined and enlightened of the nations upon earth.

Long prior, however, to this last period, and as early as the year 1000 after the Christian era, the Mahometans had begun to establish a dominion in India. Mahmoud, a Tartar soldier of fortune, usurping from the Saracens a large part of the kingdom of Bactria, pushed his conquests first into the eastern parts of Persia, and thence into India, establishing the seat of his sovereignty at Gazna, near the source of the river Indus. Thence he pursued his course towards Delhi, ravaging the country in his progress, and signalising himself by the most ardent zeal for the extirpation of the Hindoo religion. In the year 1194, Mohammed. Gori penetrated into

India as far as Benares, the great seat of the Hindoo religion and science, to which he showed himself as great an enemy as his predecessor. One of his successors fixed the seat of his empire at Delhi, which continued thenceforth to be the capital of the Mogul princes. The sovereignty founded in India by Mahmoud was overwhelmed in the year 1222 by Gengis Khan, as was his empire in the succeeding century by Tamerlane, whose posterity at this day nominally fill the throne of the Mogul empire.

The peninsula of India within the Ganges, we have seen, was invaded by the Portuguese in the beginning of the sixteenth century. They made there several establishments, and the viceroy, who resided at Goa, lived with all the splendour of an Asiatic sovereign. The subjects of the Great Mogul purchased from the Portuguese the produce of the Indian Spice Islands.

The Mogul empire was, even in the beginning of the last century, one of the most extensive and most powerful on the face of the globe. It was then governed by Aurengzebe, a man signalised equally by his crimes and by his good fortune. The Mogul Shah Jehan, the father of Aurengzebe, had conferred on his four sons the dignity of viceroys, and given them the command of four principal provinces of the empire. Aurengzebe, the youngest of the sons, formed a conspiracy with one of his brothers to dethrone their father; accordingly the old emperor was seized and imprisoned, and soon after died, as was suspected, by poison. Aurengzebe now found it necessary to get rid of his brother,

who was the accomplice of his crime; and he was no sooner removed, than this unnatural parricide openly took arms against his other two brothers, and proving victorious strangled them both in prison. It was the lot of this wretch, who merited a thousand deaths for his crimes, to enjoy a life prolonged to one hundred and three years, crowned with uninterrupted good fortune; to extend the limits of his empire over the whole peninsula of India within the Ganges, and to die one of the most splendid and powerful of the Asiatic monarchs.

The dominion of the Mogul was not absolute over all those countries which composed his empire. When Tamerlane overran India, he allowed many of the petty princes to retain their sovereignties, of which their descendants long continued in possession. These were the rajahs, nabobs, or viceroys, who exercised all the prerogatives of kings within their dominions, only paying a tribute to the Great Mogul, as being the successor of Tamerlane their conqueror, and observing the treaties by which their ancestors had recognised his superiority.

The original inhabitants of India are the Hindoos, or Gentoos, who profess the religion of Brama. Their priests or bramins pretend that their god or prophet Brama bequeathed to them a book called the Vedam, which contains his doctrines and institutions; but as this book is written in the Sanscrit, which is now a dead language, and only understood by these priests, they give what interpretation they please to the text of this religious code, and different bramins

often extract from it the most opposite doctrines and opinions. Throughout all Hindostan the laws of government, customs, and manners make a part of religion, being all transmitted from Brama, the author of this sacred volume. It is from Brama that the Indians derive their veneration for the three great rivers of their country, the Indus, the Krisna, and the Ganges. To him they ascribe the division of the people into tribes or castes, distinguished from each-other by their political and religious principles. This division of the Indian castes is characteristic of a very singular state of society. The four principal castes, or tribes, are the bramins, the soldiers, the husbandmen, and the mechanics. The bramins, as we have already observed, are the priests, who, like the Roman Catholic clergy, are some of them devoted to a life of regular discipline, as the different orders of monks; and others, like the secular clergy, mix in the world, and enjoy all the freedom of social life. The military class includes the rajahs on the coast of Coromandel, and the Nairs on the coast of Malabar. There are likewise whole nations, for example the Mahrattas, who follow arms as an hereditary profession, and who are a kind of mercenaries, who serve for pay to any power that chooses to employ them. The husbandmen, like the soldiers, follow invariably the profession of their ancestors, and occupy themselves solely in the cultivation of their lands. The tribe of mechanics is branched out into as many subdivisions as there are trades, and no man is allowed to relinquish the trade of his forefathers,—a very singular system, which, as

we formerly mentioned, prevailed likewise among the ancient Egyptians. Besides these four principal classes or tribes, there is a fifth, that of the Pariahs, which is the outcast of all the rest. The persons who compose it are employed in the meanest offices of society. They bury the dead; they are the scavengers of the town; and so much is their condition held in detestation, that if any one of this class touches a person belonging to any of the four great castes or tribes, it is allowable to put him to death upon the spot. All these classes, or castes, are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers; they are not allowed to intermarry, to live, or to eat together, and whoever transgresses these rules is banished as a disgrace to his tribe. It is well observed by the Abbé Raynal, that this artificial arrangement, which is antecedent to the tradition of known records, is a most striking proof of the great antiquity of this nation; since nothing appears more contrary to the natural progress of the social connexions, and such an idea could only be the result of a studied plan of legislation, which pre-supposes a great proficiency in civilisation and knowledge.

Between the years 1751 and 1760 the English East India Company conquered and obtained possession of the finest provinces of Hindostan—Bengal, Bahar, and part of Orissa, a territory equal in dimensions to the kingdom of France, abounding in manufacturing towns, possessed of an immense population, and yielding a magnificent revenue; and these territories have been constantly and rapidly extending from that

period. The East India company thence has the benefit of the whole trade of India, Arabia, Persia, Thibet, and China; and, with the exception of some settlements ceded to the Dutch, of the whole of Eastern Asia.

END OF VOL. V.

LONDON.
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

Form 410